

theories
and
critical
studies



**The Future
of Society**



The Future of Society

A Critique
of Modern
Bourgeois
Philosophical
and Socio-Political
Conceptions



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian
Edited by *Murad Saifulin*
Designed by *Vladimir Levinson*

БУДУЩЕЕ ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА
(Критика современных буржуазных философских
и социально-политических концепций)

Под редакцией профессора,
доктора философских наук Е. Д. Модржинской
и член-корреспондента АН СССР Ц. А. Степаняна

На английском языке

© Translated into English Progress Publishers 1973

First printing 1973

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

	Pages
Introduction	7

Part I

THE EMERGENCE OF THE SCIENCE OF THE FUTURE

Chapter 1. The Development of Ideas on the Future in Social Thought (Up to the Emergence of Marxism)	15
Chapter 2. Marxist-Leninist Scientific Forecasting	40

Part II

BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT ABOUT THE FUTURE

Chapter 1. Social Forecasting in Bourgeois Philosophy of History	75
Chapter 2. Neo-Positivist Scepticism Versus Marxist Historicism	85
Anti-historism and nihilist rejection of the science of society	88
Anti-historism and the problem of the communist transformation of society	100
Chapter 3. Existentialism and the Future of Mankind	109
Chapter 4. The Teilhardist Conception of Future of Mankind	121
Chapter 5. Structuralism and Historical Forecasting	131

Part III

A CRITIQUE OF MODERN BOURGEOIS SOCIO-POLITICAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE

Chapter 1. The Anti-Historism of the Ideology of Industrialism	145
Chapter 2. The Capitalist Apology Under the Guise of the "Single Industrial Society" (A Critique of the Views of the French Sociologist Raymond Aron on the Society of the Future).	161
Chapter 3. The Theory of Convergence	178
Chapter 4. The Utopia of the World State and the Problem of Regionalism	195

Certain philosophical "arguments" in favour of the idea of the world state	196
The utopian nature of the idea of the world state	199
Regional associations: two approaches	203
Chapter 5. The "Formed Society"—a Totalitarian Conception	213
Chapter 6. Mankind's Future as Seen by Right Social Democrats	229
Chapter 7. The Anti-Communist Nature of Ideas of Social Progress in Bourgeois Futurology and the Stages of Economic Growth and "Evolution" Theories	253

Part IV

PROBLEMS OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING

Chapter 1. Scientific and Technological Forecasting in the West	281
Population growth and food resources	282
Use of mineral and fuel resources in the future	286
Man and the machine	293
Town planning, transport and communications	298
The information "explosion"	300
The exploration of outer space	303
The influence of science on the spiritual life of mankind in the future	306
Chapter 2. Some Problems of Scientific and Technological Forecasting in the USSR	309
The prospects of the world fuel and raw material balance	315
Automation and cybernetisation of social production as a new stage in the development of productive forces	318
Population and food resources	321
The town of the future. Transport and communications prospects	325
Future problems of the exploration of the Earth and outer space	330
Science and social progress	336

Part V

COMMUNISM—THE FUTURE OF ALL MANKIND

The Inaugurator of the Communist Future of All Mankind	344
The Essence of Communism and Its Main Phases of Development	347
The Main Historical Stages of the Communist Formation	360
The Historical Inevitability of World Communism as the Highest Stage of World Civilisation	367
Sources of the Unlimited Development of Communist Society	372

INTRODUCTION

People have always sought to lift the veil separating the present from the future. These attempts were closely bound up with the efforts of progressive thinkers to sketch an outline, albeit a very general one, of an ideal social system which would set a limit on the sufferings of the working people. The dreams of such a social order, combined with criticism of the vices of the exploitative system, gave rise to various types of utopian socialism. And for many a long year the realisation of this happy future remained a dream.

The emergence of the Marxist doctrine of society marked the change-over of socialism from a utopia into a science. The communist future of mankind ceased to be a dream of a model society appealing to reason and became a scientifically based prospect, proceeding from a profound analysis of the objective laws of social development.

This prospect is indissolubly linked with the development of the working-class movement, with the class struggle and with the liberation of the proletariat which, in freeing itself, also frees the whole of society and organises the building of socialism. But all this also involves the inevitable collapse of capitalism.

The Marxist-Leninist approach to the problems of scientific forecasting is examined in this work with regard both to its historical aspect and fundamental tenets.

Social progress as the historically determined transition from capitalism to socialism has become the dominant

feature of the new epoch in human history, the beginning of which was ushered in by the Great October Socialist Revolution. Lenin wrote: "Progress, if we leave out for the moment the possibility of temporary steps backward, can be made only in the direction of *socialist* society, only in the direction of the *socialist revolution*."¹

It is this mechanism of social development, discovered by the founders of Marxism, which has determined the negative attitude of bourgeois ideologists to real social progress. This attitude is the product of the basic class interests of the bourgeoisie, which are incompatible with the objective necessity of historical development.

Bourgeois social thought attacked not only Marxist-Leninist theory and the revolutionary movement of the working class, but also the actual building of socialism, that is, the realisation of the communist prospect for the future.

Modern bourgeois conceptions of social development are characterised by an idealist and anti-dialectical interpretation of social processes. It is this attitude towards social development which explains why bourgeois doctrines and schools have not withstood the test of time and why their various appraisals and forecasts have turned out to be wrong. Idealist philosophy is incapable of ascertaining and understanding the objective laws of the functioning and development of society. Any modern trend in bourgeois philosophy demonstrates this quite clearly (see the chapters dealing specifically with positivism, existentialism, structuralism, etc.).

The inability to penetrate into the essence of social phenomena is common to all these trends for a variety of reasons. For example, how could positivist philosophy, which rejects the possibility of cognising the essence of phenomena and excludes dialectics from the science, ever reveal the laws of social development and the direction of the social process? Existentialism, which divorces man from society and diverts human activity to the sphere of private emotions, is also incapable of making scientifically based deductions about the direction in which human society is developing. The same applies to neo-Thomism, which abounds with the ideas of Catholic doctrine, regarding the sacred

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 316.

order of the church as the peak of historical development and opposing mystical religious ideas to the scientific principles of communism.

The Christian conception of the social process is an eclectic combination of fatalism and voluntarism, which reduces the role of the subjective factor in history to nothing, a role based on the cognition and rational application of the laws of nature and society. In recent times the West has seen the spread of new religious conceptions of progress which claim to combine the methods of the natural sciences and religion in treating all problems, including the future development of mankind. However, as is clearly pointed out in the chapter on the conception of Teilhard de Chardin, this abstract humanist trend fails to understand the specific nature of society as a social phenomenon, and, consequently, its laws of development as well.

The sociological and socio-political thought in the capitalist countries of the West also fails to understand the prospects for mankind. Rejection of the dialectico-materialist approach to history as a natural-historical process, lack of a concrete historical analysis of society as an integral organism, and the rejection of the laws of social development—all these defects in bourgeois social thinking deprive it of the possibility to make a proper scientific examination of the prospects for social development and distort its vision of the future. Consequently, the basic bourgeois sociological conceptions of the future of mankind are one-sided. Bourgeois theoreticians do not see the laws of developing society as a system having a qualitatively determined structure at each historical stage. They either try to reject the concept of social development altogether and regard society as a static, immobile abstraction, or single out in a random way this or that aspect of social development as its determining factor and make this aspect absolute. Thus they single out from time to time, say, technology, or the political superstructure, or moral consciousness, or human organisational activity, or biological instincts.

The adherents and propagandists of modern bourgeois conceptions of social development do not always openly criticise Marxist views on the prospects for the development of society, but objectively their theories are invariably directed against Marxism and communism.

What is characteristic of these conceptions is their claim to refute the Marxist-Leninist theory of social progress. Sometimes this is not declared openly, whereas other times it is stated quite categorically. But in either case bourgeois ideologists seek to create an alternative to Marxist-Leninist doctrine and to advance a view of the future which precludes the transformation of the world along socialist lines.

This tendency has received concrete expression in the emergence and rapid development of the so-called futurology which is intended by those who created it to challenge the Marxist-Leninist conception of the future of society. It regards the Marxist-Leninist conception as an "obsolete" theory of ever-ascending progress. In their most general sociological premises and deductions concerning the future, however, bourgeois ideologists are in fact seeking to perpetuate the capitalist system.

Modern bourgeois socio-political views of the future contain an interesting reflection of the process of growing differentiation among the intelligentsia in the capitalist countries. Following the polarisation of the ideologists themselves (towards the forces of progress or the forces of reaction) their theories also assume a variety of shades.

One might perhaps note as a growing tendency the interest in capitalist countries in the pacifist brand of social utopia. As a result of the breach between the adherents of bourgeois ideology, which is cosmopolitan in essence, one sees a clear identification of its extremely reactionary wing, on the one hand, and intensified attempts to find a solution to social problems and the future of mankind in pacifist ideas, on the other. The scientific untenability of these attempts becomes obvious upon closer examination of these theories, as can be seen in the chapter analysing modern mondialism and regionalism. However, these theorists occasionally have the best subjective intentions—they seek a way out of the present international situation which will lead, in their view, to the consolidation of peace. The world outlook and social origins of these theories prevent their adherents from finding the true way to their desired aim, but nevertheless people who support these views can make a contribution to the struggle for peace and against militarism and neo-fascism. One must conduct a patient dialogue with them,

helping them to overcome the limitations of their views. Here one cannot help recalling Lenin's apt remark: "...It is obviously by no means a matter of indifference to us whether we shall deal with those people from the bourgeois camp who are inclined to settle the problem by war, or with those who are inclined towards pacifism, even the worst kind of pacifism, which from the communist viewpoint will not stand the slightest criticism."¹

At the same time another tendency is becoming increasingly apparent in bourgeois thought about the future, a tendency which clearly reflects the growing reactionary nature of capitalism as a system, the incompatibility of the capitalist system with democracy. Striking confirmation of this is the neo-fascist version of the "formed society". A detailed analysis of this is given in one of the chapters.

Considerable influence is exerted on social thought in the West by man's great achievements in mastering nature and also by the scientific and technological revolution. But in reflecting the processes of this revolution in their socio-economic and socio-political conceptions, bourgeois social thinkers usually distort its social aspects. This distortion takes various forms. There are attempts to interpret scientific and technological progress as a means of perpetuating capitalism and the desire to identify progress in the sphere of technology with social progress; supporters of modern technicism also try to explain and thereby justify all the vices of capitalist society by saying that they are the product of technological progress. Furthermore one finds both over-optimistic and extremely gloomy and pessimistic moods and opinions among them. All this motley variety can be fitted perfectly easily in the real framework of bourgeois thought, which is limited both in its epistemological and class possibilities. However, in spite of this, elements of anxiety and worry figure fairly frequently even in the case of eminent bourgeois ideologists and theorists.

Below we examine some of the most widespread theories about the future of mankind in modern bourgeois social thought. One of the main theories is the ideology of industrialism, which bases its hopes primarily on the omnipo-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 264.

tence of technology. But even on this, it would seem, very firm ground, bourgeois thinkers do not feel secure and become victims of "disillusion with progress". A vivid example of this is the new book by the famous French sociologist Raymond Aron with this phrase as its title.¹

Attempts to find "similarities" between capitalism and socialism with the accent on their alleged increasing rapprochement are particularly characteristic of those who support the convergence theory which is basically anti-communist, although this is sometimes carefully camouflaged. This theory is examined in detail below, with a number of other very new versions by bourgeois and reformist sociologists.

Because of its transitional character the present age is making the ideological struggle more and more intense. The future of society is one of the spring-boards on which extremely fierce ideological battles have already begun and will continue in the future.

Naturally, this book does not claim to offer a full examination of all the aspects of this struggle.

We do not wish to repeat what has already been said in other works on the development of social thought. A broad historical analysis of the development of social thought was provided by Academician G. P. Frantsov.² I. S. Kon, Y. N. Semyonov and Kh. N. Momjan have also written some interesting critiques of bourgeois philosophy of history and social philosophy.³

We do not claim to have provided a full explanation and analysis of the philosophy of history in full. We are interested primarily in the problem of scientific forecasting, its history and present state and, consequently, its theoretical and practical aspects, the various solutions offered (both social and those relating to the natural science) and, finally, the ideological struggle which has arisen on these questions.

¹ Raymond Aron, *Les desillusions du progrès*, Paris, 1969.

² G. P. Frantsov, *The Historical Trends in Social Thought*, Moscow, 1965 (in Russian).

³ Y. N. Semyonov, *Social Progress and Modern Bourgeois Social Philosophy*, Moscow, 1965 (in Russian); Kh. N. Momjan, *The October Revolution and the Collapse of Idealist Conceptions of Social Development*, Moscow, 1967 (in Russian).

This book examines the problem of scientific forecasting from the historical and the methodological point of view (the first two chapters). It is followed by a critical analysis of modern bourgeois philosophy with reference to explaining its attitude towards the prospects for social development. This section includes a study not only of traditional philosophical systems, but of a number of new trends.

The next section of the book examines the latest trends in bourgeois socio-political thought on the future of mankind. An attempt is made to present a broad outline of the ideological struggle on the prospects for social development.

We have taken full account of the complex nature of these problems. Thus, for example, we are of the opinion that there are grounds for assessing in various ways the socio-political and scientific forecasts of bourgeois specialists on questions relating to the future. This is why we have devoted a special section of the book to analysing modern forecasting in the sphere of the natural and technical sciences both in the capitalist countries of the West and in the USSR.

Marxist-Leninist theory alone is capable of scientifically forecasting the social process. The emergence and development of the world revolutionary movement, the socialist system and communist construction provide historical confirmation of the Marxist scientific foresight that the future of mankind is communism. The final section deals with this question.

This collective work provides a more or less general picture of the history and logic of the origin and development of ideas about the future of mankind, showing how bourgeois and socialist ideologies differ on the basic problems of the development of mankind.

If this book stimulates the reader to new reflections and enquiry and, in particular, to generalising the new processes of social development, of which we are all the participants and witnesses, we shall consider that our efforts have not been in vain.

This book was compiled in the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The authors of the chapters are as follows: introduction—Y. D. Modrzhinskaya; Part I,

ch. 1—I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, ch. 2—V. S. Gott; Part II, ch. 1—G. Schultze and A. Bauer (GDR), ch. 2—L. N. Danilova, ch. 3—Y. G. Fogeler, ch. 4—E. M. Babosov, ch. 5—M. N. Gretskey; Part III, ch. 1—M. L. Polishchuk, ch. 2—L. S. Yeremenko, ch. 3—L. A. Leontiev, ch. 4—Y. M. Kondakov, ch. 5—L. V. Andreyev, V. S. Markov, ch. 6—V. A. Nikitin, ch. 7—Y. D. Modrzhinskaya; Part IV, chs. 1 and 2—I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, R. A. Fesenko; Part V—Ts. A. Stepanyan. Auxiliary scientific work was performed by T. V. Naumova, the secretary of the team of authors.

Part I

THE EMERGENCE OF THE SCIENCE OF THE FUTURE

Chapter 1

THE DEVELOPMENT OF IDEAS ON THE FUTURE IN SOCIAL THOUGHT

(Up to the Emergence of Marxism)

More than a century ago the emergence of Marxism marked the beginning of scientific forecasting of the development of society. The theory of scientific communism brought about a radical change in the development of ideas on the future of mankind.

Increasing attention is paid in discussions on the future of mankind to the question of whether this or that conception responds to the demands of modern science and the retention in bourgeois social thought of vestiges of pre-scientific conceptions belonging to former ages. So there is more need for a study of ideas on the future of mankind, beginning with their development in social thought before the emergence of Marxism.

What we mean here is basically the pre-history, the gathering of the prerequisites for scientific forecasting. Material about this is to be found primarily in sources on the history of social utopias and the philosophy of history. But since the subject of interest to us is not either the history of utopias or the philosophy of history (statements about the future are found both in general philosophy and natural science, as well as religious works and fiction), the researcher's field of vision must include works on the following additional subjects: the history of socio-political and economic theories (not falling within the history of social utopias); the history of philosophy and natural science (not falling within the philosophy of history); the history of religion; the history of literature, and also ethnographic and archaeological material.

Marxist literature has dealt comparatively thoroughly (thanks mainly to the works of V. P. Volgin and other historians) with the problem of pre-Marxian utopian socialism. The recently completed six-volume *History of Philosophy* and also a number of other works on various aspects of the history of philosophy in various periods and on individual philosophers are of great assistance to the researcher. The same also applies to the recently published courses on the history of political and economic theories.

Soviet scholars have made considerable progress in the elaboration of the problems pertaining to the history of natural science and the history of religion. But much work in these spheres still lies ahead.

It would be impossible in this chapter to try to trace, even in general outline, the whole process of the development of ideas on the future in pre-Marxian social thought. The aim of the chapter is more modest: to outline the main problems encountered by the researcher in this branch of the history of social thought, namely, problems concerning the formation of ideas on the future in primitive thought, the development of religious conceptions of the future, utopianism and its evolution, and finally the problem of the formation of prerequisites for scientific forecasting in the narrower sense—in the sense of the direct historical sources of the latter.

*Presentism in primitive thought.*¹ Before examining the development of ideas about the future it is essential to dwell on the point of departure of the study—on the condition of social thought (or, to be more precise, primitive thinking), which preceded the emergence of the ideas in question. Thanks to archaeologists and ethnographers we are now able to judge this condition with a reasonable degree of objectivity from two groups of sources: the material of archaeological excavations (primarily those of primitive burials), and the material of ethnographic studies of the life of tribes whose cultural level judging by archaeological information is comparable with that of primitive mankind at the various stages of its development (particularly mate-

¹ For more detail, see I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, "The Development of Ideas about the Future: First Steps (Presentism in Primitive Thought)", *Sovetskaya etnografia*, No. 5, 1968.

rial relating to customs, religions and folklore). Of special importance to us is primitive mythology.

The sources show that only after long development did primitive thought conceive the idea of the past and (considerably later) the future as categories different from the present. In the early stages of the development of primitive society the problem of the duration of time appears not to have been perceived by man. Figuratively speaking, his mental vision was capable of embracing only the events "of the moment" and not of extending to the events of the past and certainly not to those of the future. The material of the Neanderthal burials (Middle Paleolithic) enables us to assume the emergence of concepts more or less definitely distinguishing the present from the past.

But even at later stages when mythology had been formed, including legends about the origin of the earth and man, life beyond the grave and the human destiny (discussed below), a characteristic feature of primitive thought attracts the attention: the past and future are thought of to a greater or lesser extent (depending on the level of development of thought) as being the same as the present. This, incidentally, made it seem possible to "predict" the future and even "influence" it with the aid of magic.

The mythological ancestors of the tribal community led more or less the same way of life as the actual tellers of the myths. According to these myths, the deceased members of the tribe continued to hunt in a world beyond the grave which did not differ essentially from the earthly world. The material of primitive burials, in which objects essential for the dead person to continue in the afterlife the same way of life as on earth were discovered, bears this out fairly conclusively.

This feature of primitive thought, which was wholly determined by the conditions of life of the tribal community (in particular, the very slow, almost imperceptible changes in these conditions during the course of many generations) is stressed by all Soviet specialists.¹

¹ See P. P. Yefimenko, *Primitive Society*, Leningrad, 1938, p. 536; S. N. Zamyatnin, *Paleolithic Sketches*, Moscow, Leningrad, 1961, pp. 33, 34, 44, 54; L. Y. Shternberg, *Primitive Religion in the Light of Ethnography*, Leningrad, 1936, p. 330; S. A. Tokarev, *Early Forms of Religion and Their Development*, Moscow, 1964, pp. 197-

This likening of the past and future to the present (presentism) in primitive thought attracts the attention to the problem of the specific features of the latter. The well-known works of Lucien Levy-Bruhl on this subject¹ have been seriously criticised. There is a great need for special works to study the problem comprehensively, from the Marxist standpoint.

Religious conceptions of the future. The accumulation of early ideas about the future is closely bound up with the evolution of primitive mythology from the fairy-tale myths which explained (in fantasy, of course) the most simple phenomena of nature, to the myths which explained the establishment of tribal morals and customs and, finally, to the myths explaining the origin of man and the world as a whole, and also the fate of the dead. Whereas the first are, as a rule, hardly connected at all with religious concepts, then not properly developed, and the second are connected sporadically (mainly with totemism and other forms of primitive religion), the third are definitely linked with the fairly developed views of a religious character.² Thus, the main sources for studying early ideas about the future are material on the history of mythology and, closely related to it, the history of religion.

The questions as to how the existing orders, people themselves and the world as a whole appeared and also where the dead "depart" did not arise from idle curiosity. The answers to them were of great importance for the life of the tribal community. They had a bearing on the authority of the

204; A. M. Zolotarev, *The Tribal System and Primitive Mythology*, Moscow, 1964, pp. 91-93; V. N. Chernetsov, "The Concept of the Soul with the Ob Ugrians", *Transactions of the Miklukho-Maklai Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, New Series, Vol. 51, "Studies and Materials on Questions of Primitive Religions", Moscow, 1959, p. 152; G. M. Vasilevich, "Early Ideas About the World with the Evenki", *Ibid.*, p. 169; *The Peoples of Australia and Oceania*, Moscow, 1956, pp. 234, 244, 279, 472-473, 625; V. F. Zybkovets, *The Pre-Religious Epoch. The History of the Formation of Social Consciousness*, Moscow, 1959, pp. 144, 145, 151, 181; P. F. Protaseny, *Problems of Communication and Thought Among Primitive People*, Minsk, 1961, pp. 95, 102, 128. (All the above-mentioned works are in Russian.)

¹ L. Levy-Bruhl, *La Mentalité primitive* and *Le Surnaturel et la nature dans la mentalité primitive*, Paris, 1931.

² See L. Y. Shternberg, *Primitive Religion in the Light of Ethnography*; S. A. Tokarev, *Early Forms of Religion and Their Development*; A. M. Zolotarev, *The Tribal System and Primitive Mythology*.

elders, the education of the young in the traditions of the established order, behaviour towards the dead, in a word, on all the many aspects of the community's way of life. All this encouraged the primitive thought, which for a long time did not venture beyond a narrow set of concrete, empirical concepts connected with the needs and impressions of the moment, to tackle the fairly abstract problem of the possibility of a different order of things.

As a result human thought advanced considerably in this direction even in primitive society: the idea arose of original chaos out of which the existing world was formed; images were created of so-called cultural heroes—mythical ancestors who were accredited with the discovery of fire, the invention of tools, the establishment of the existing order. Finally there gradually arose ideas of "other worlds" to which the dead "passed over", beginning with fantastic lands (or islands) somewhere far away on earth and ending with equally fantastic worlds in the sky and under the earth. All this ideological arsenal subsequently equipped modern religions.

Here we are interested not in the role of this set of concepts in the history of religion, but in the idea of the possibility of the existence of "a different world". This was a considerable achievement in the development of human thought from the concrete to the abstract—the embryo of the concepts which arose later of a future which could and must be different from the present.

True, it was a vast distance from the idea of "another world" to the concept of "another future". As already mentioned, the "afterworld" of primitive religions was a copy of the earthly one. The afterworld of modern religions has not departed very far from that. Whereas in the religions of the North American Indians the hunter's soul speeds over the snow's soul on the skies' soul in pursuit of the moose's soul in the "hereafter", the paradise of the antique myths, the Bible and the Koran, is also very similar to the palace gardens of the slave-owners, and hell to the dungeons where slaves toiled away or languished after suffering infernal torture aimed at quelling the rebellious spirit.

However, ideas about a "different future" gradually gained ground in spite of religious dogma, because they corresponded to the urgent requirements of the ideological

struggle which accompanied the disintegration of primitive society and later the development and crisis of slave-owning society.

In the course of this struggle the ancient religious philosophical thought worked out a whole complex of ideas conducive to the development of views about the future as something different from the present. These included the idea of retribution in the afterlife for one's behaviour on earth, the idea of Providentialism—divine providence which determined the course of events independently of human will, and the idea of Messianism—the future coming of the Saviour or Messiah who would radically change the existing order for the better. Other conceptions linked with the idea of Providentialism were elaborated, namely, that of the historical process as the cyclic alternation of different socio-political orders (within the framework of the experience of past centuries) with a recurring cycles of catastrophes on a world-wide scale (the flood, etc.) and that of the motive forces of this process as a struggle between the superhuman forces of good and evil, which was to end in the triumph of justice. Finally, a conception linked with the idea of Messianism arose, namely eschatology—the doctrine of the inevitable coming of the “end of the world” after which the world would be totally transformed.

The process of formation of religious conceptions of a “different future” was a long and complex one. Even Buddhism, the basic dogmas of which developed in the 5th to 3rd centuries B.C. and which made use of many of the great achievements of early Indian philosophy, allows of no other future than the eternal transmigration of souls and the final return of the world to the initial state of “non-being”. But alongside this, even in Egyptian religion of the second millennium B.C., we observe the appearance of Providentialist, Messianic and eschatological ideas which, in the following millennium, were developed in the Mazdaic (old Persian) and Judaic religions from which they were subsequently accepted by Christianity and later Islam.¹

¹ See S. A. Tokarev, *Religion in the History of the Peoples of the World*, Moscow, 1964, p. 288 et al.; G. P. Frantsov, *The Sources of Religion and Free Thought*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1959, p. 410 et al.; A. P. Kazhdan, *Religion and Atheism in the Ancient World*, Moscow, 1957, p. 54 et al.; A. Donini, *Lineamenti di storia delle religioni*, Rome, 1960, p. 26 et al.

It has now been proved that the basic tenets of Christian eschatology were worked out in antique religious literature of the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C., when apocalyptic moods became widespread during the impending crisis of slave-owning society, and each year the "end of the world" was expected.¹ Throughout the first three centuries A.D. in the ideological struggle which reflected the convulsions experienced by the antiquity, Christian eschatology included the Chiliast (Millenarianist) doctrine that Christ would return to earth to rule for a thousand years and assumed the character of a distinctive "history of the future". The "second coming" of Christ was expected at any moment and the establishment of "Christ's Millennium" in which Jesus and the resurrected righteous would rule people justly, and Satan and the powers of darkness would be deprived of the opportunity to harm people. Then, at the end of the thousand years it was believed that the Satanic forces would revolt, and be finally defeated, that there would be a "universal resurrection of the dead", "the end of the world", "the day of the last judgement" and a completely new state of "eternal bliss" for the righteous and "eternal torment" for the sinners.²

For all the obvious absurdity of these fantastic, highly unscientific ideas, one should not forget that the religious conceptions of the future exerted a colossal influence on the masses and were a powerful ideological weapon in the socio-political struggle. In particular, Messianic and eschatological expectations were the ideological banner of many slave uprisings at least from the 2nd century B.C.³ These expectations gave strength to the communities of early Christians

¹ See S. A. Tokarev, *Religion in the History of the Peoples of the World*, p. 358; N. A. Mashkin, "Eschatology and Messianism in the Final Period of the Roman Republic", *Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences, History and Philosophy Series*, 1946, Vol. 3, No. 5.

² L. Atzberger, *Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vorchristlichen Zeit*, Freiburg, 1896.

Here only one of the most developed Chiliast versions of Christian eschatology is given, moreover in a more or less logical sequence of predicted events. In fact, there existed several versions with the most fantastically intertwined events of this kind, extremely remote from elementary logic.

³ See N. A. Mashkin, "Eschatology and Messianism in the Final Period of the Roman Republic", *Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences, History and Philosophy Series*, 1946, Vol. 3, No. 5, p. 444.

during the terrible persecutions in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. They also had a very strong influence on the whole culture of late antiquity.

But the fourth century witnessed the sudden decline of eschatology. The Christian church became established instead of persecuted; the former Messianic and eschatological expectations with their explosive ideological content directed against the existing order became "superfluous", and the "second coming", expected year in year out, simply did not take place, so it was necessary to find an explanation for this. In addition, the most glaring discrepancies were discovered in eschatology itself, obvious even to the believers of those times. They resulted from the mechanical mixing of old (mostly Judaic) and new religious concepts.¹ Thus, the idea of divine predestination contradicted the idea of man's free will, i.e., the possibility of falling into sin contrary to the will of God, and the ideas of the "end of the world", "the day of the last judgement" and particularly "Christ's Millennium" contradicted that of the immortality of the soul, for Christians believed that after a person's death his soul immediately went either to heaven or to hell and, therefore, neither "Doomsday", nor "the Last Judgement" nor the "Millennium" had any significance for it. Here too explanations were needed.

As a result Chiliasm was declared to be a heresy. In the writings of Saint Augustine (354-430) a prominent place was given to the doctrine of the eternal struggle between the realm of Satan, "the earthly city" and "the city of God", embodied on earth by the church. The latter was destined to triumph, but in the indeterminate future, so that the problem of an impending "Doomsday" was replaced by the problem of "the salvation of the soul" of each person by means of communion with the church. Augustine also tried to solve the insoluble task of reconciling the ideas of Divine predestination and human free will.

For many centuries Augustine's teaching determined the main tenets of official Christian eschatology.² These tenets

¹ See S. A. Tokarev, *Religion in the History of the Peoples of the World*, p. 488.

² B. Töpfer, "Die Entwicklung chiliastischer Zukunftserwartungen im Mittelalter", *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Gesellschafts und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, Jahrgang XII, No. 3, 1963, S. 253-262.

were developed in the writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) which, to this day, are canonical for Catholicism. Orthodox and Protestant eschatology differs from Catholic eschatology only in inessential details.

In the meantime Chiliasm, repressed by official church ideology which was now hostile to it, continued to smoulder in the numerous heresies of the Middle Ages and then, in the late Middle Ages (roughly from the 13th century), flared up again in the maturing crisis of West European feudalism.

The advent of the Enlightenment dealt a severe blow to church ideology. Chiliasm and related eschatological views became the property of a few individual sects and ceased to serve as the banner of anti-feudal movements. Their place was taken by new conceptions of a utopian character, far more effective as ideological weapons, which are discussed below. As for Chiliasm, it "revived" again in the last century and exists to this day, but now as the ideological weapon of the reaction in its struggle against the forces of progress.¹ Eschatological Chiliast views form the basis of the dogmas of the modern Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses and other sects.

It should be noted that religious conceptions about the future have not remained unchanged. "It is precisely because the roots of religion are social, because religion serves as the fantastic reflection of external forces dominating people in their everyday existence, that eschatology and Chiliasm even when they proceed from a single literary source (such as, for example, the Revelation of St. John, which served early Christianity, medieval sects and the Adventists), are subjected to historical revision: the eschatology and Chiliasm of the early Christians differ from the corresponding ideas of the medieval anti-feudal sects, just as the latter differ from the eschatological Chiliast views of the Adventists."²

It is not possible to describe here the evolution of eschatology over the centuries. Meanwhile the study of religious conceptions about the future is important not only because

¹ See F. L. Baumer, "Twentieth Century Version of the Apocalypse", *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, January 1954, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 623-40.

² A. I. Klibanov, *A History of Religious Sects in Russia (From the 1860s to 1917)*, Moscow, 1965, p. 308 (in Russian).

these conceptions are the first that go to form the pre-history of scientific forecasting, but also because, as mentioned above, they played an important role in the social struggle of past millennia.

Studies of this nature are also relevant because religious conceptions about the future had a great influence on the philosophy of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in particular, on the philosophico-historical conceptions of Leibnitz, Lessing, Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel. They exerted an equally strong influence on utopian thought, particularly on the works of Saint-Simon and Fourier, Owen and Weitling. Without studying them it is difficult to understand certain reactionary trends in modern Western philosophy, such as the conceptions of Berdyaev and Toynbee. Some bourgeois historians and philosophers tendentiously portray Marxism as a special type of eschatology, and this in itself demands that attention be paid to the latter, since an analysis of it reveals the complete untenability of such fabrications. Finally, the study of religious conceptions about the future is important with respect to extending anti-religious propaganda: there can be few such vivid examples of how religious dogmas are incompatible with common sense as in this sphere which is of interest to a large public.

Utopism, its types, forms and evolution. Alongside religious conceptions about the future and in close connection with them, there developed conceptions of another character—utopian ones, not yet scientific, but no longer religious. They differ from the latter in that the “different future” of people is determined here not by superhuman forces, but by people themselves, their reason and actions. This is a fundamental difference. And this is why, in spite of many similar features and connections between religious and utopian conceptions about the future, it is wrong to confuse them, as has been done, for example, by Karl Mannheim and other bourgeois sociologists, who unreservedly rank Chiliasm with the utopias.¹

Analysis of utopian conceptions of the future is complicated by the fact that in historico-philosophical literature (including Marxist works) the definition of the concept of a

¹ G. Duveau, “Introduction à une sociologie de l'Utopie”, *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie*, N. 9, 1950, p. 39.

utopia, the principles of classifying utopias, and the main trends in the evolution of utopistic views continue to remain debatable.¹ Without going into detail on these questions, each of which deserves special examination, we shall confine ourselves to a few general remarks of a purely preliminary nature.

With regard to the concept of utopia (in the historico-sociological sense), it would seem more acceptable to define it as an arbitrary idea, not directly connected with Providentialism, about the desired future of the world and mankind, an idea which is not based on a scientific interpretation of the objective laws of development of nature and society. This definition proceeds from Lenin's famous thesis about utopia in politics as the type of wish that can never come true—neither now nor afterwards, a wish that is not based on social forces and is not supported by the growth and development of political, class forces.² It reflects the substance of a utopia and makes it possible to distinguish this concept from the similar, but not identical concepts of eschatology, fantasy, didacticism,³ etc.

Most utopias deal with problems of a future society and come under the heading of social utopias. However, some concentrate on problems of science and technology, technical questions of town planning, provision of medical services, etc., with little or no reference to the social side of the question. Such utopias, it is true, did not develop on the whole until the second half of the 19th century. However, in their embryonic, primitive form they can also be found earlier.⁴ The various types of utopias similar to the above-mentioned may conveniently be classified under the general heading of technical. More often, however, one finds utopias in which social problems are only slightly less prominent than technical ones. This type comes under the intermediary heading

¹ See quoted issue of the *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, S. 197, which deals, among other things, with the problem of "typical forms of utopias, and the problem of the nature and consequently the definition of the utopia".

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 355.

³ Here we have in mind works containing instructions to sovereigns.

⁴ See, for example, the remarks of Roger Bacon (13th century) on the science and technology of the future.

of socio-technical.¹ There are also pacifist utopias. Finally, there is the special heading of anti-utopias which, unlike utopias, draw arbitrary pictures of an undesirable future for the world and mankind.

The basis for the classification of social utopias is not the form of the utopian works or the secondary peculiarities of their content,² but the basic principle: which social system is reflected or portrayed in the given utopia. From this point of view social utopias may be divided into those which idealise primitive society (communal ones), slave-owning, feudal, bourgeois and socialist.³ Each type, in its turn, may be divided according to the same principle into groups and sub-groups. Thus, according to the classification proposed by V. P. Volgin, socialist utopias may be divided into socialist ones (proclaiming the principle "to each according to his labour") and communist ones ("to each according to his needs"). Bourgeois utopias contain petty-bourgeois (egalitarian, egalitarian-cooperative, etc.) utopias.⁴

This type of classification is determined by the principles expounded by Marx and Engels in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, in which a description is given of types of feudal, petty-bourgeois, "true", bourgeois and critical-utopian socialism. Naturally, the above-mentioned types of utopias are of a concrete historical character, i.e., by virtue of the principle on which it is based the classification in question acquires meaning only within the framework of definite historical epochs.

An additional difficulty in analysing utopias is produced by the question of their form. It would be wrong to regard as utopias only "state novels" or socio-political treatises of

¹ See I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, "The Future Through the Eyes of a 17th-Century Thinker (From the Pre-history of Scientific Forecasting)", in the collection *The Future of Science*, Moscow, 1966 (in Russian).

² As is the case with certain Western writers who contrast Thomas More with Tommaso Campanella, thereby deducing two, as they have it, different types of utopias (see, for example, F. Polak, *The Image of the Future*, Vol. 1, New York, 1961, p. 220).

³ One might quote as examples: of the first—Jambulus' utopia, of the second—Plato, of the third—M. Shcherbatov, of the fourth—James Harrington, and of the fifth—Thomas More, Tommaso Campanella, etc.

⁴ See V. P. Volgin, "The Heritage of Utopian Socialism", *The History of Socialist Doctrines, Collected Essays*, Moscow, 1962, p. 18 et al.

the same type as the well-known works by Saint-Simon and Fourier. Indeed, as is no less well-known, elements which constitute the essence of the utopia are found in works which, generally speaking, cannot be classed as utopias themselves. We also find them in eschatological, Chiliastic works (in Müntzer, say, who developed clearly utopian views in a purely religious form), and in many works of pure fantasy, beginning with folk tales and ending with science fiction, in the afore-mentioned books of instruction for sovereigns and in works of social satire (such as Rabelais and Swift).

Such complexity makes it advisable to understand the concept of utopism as the type of approach to the problems of the future in which Providentialism essentially loses its significance, and a scientific understanding of the objective laws of the development of nature and society has not yet been attained. This interpretation of utopism makes it possible to analyse more profoundly the views not only of the utopians, the authors of full-scale utopias, but also all manner of other writers who cannot be unreservedly classed with the utopians, but whose works contain elements of utopism.

Seen from this angle the history of utopian thought appears not as a collection of utopias arranged in a chronological order, but as the process of evolution of utopism, developing logically in accordance with changing economic and socio-political conditions, and reflecting the concrete historical ups and downs in the class struggle. This makes it possible to contrast the Marxist analysis of the history of social utopias, characteristic of Soviet historical literature, all the more sharply with the picture of the process in question as a simple filiation of ideas independent of the socio-political struggle in each epoch, which is characteristic of non-Marxist literature.

Examining the evolution of utopism, we find that it consists of two stages: ascent and decline, the dividing line between them being the appearance of scientific sociology, a scientific approach to the problems of historical development, scientific communism—the appearance of Marxism. Until this division there was a struggle in utopian thought between progressive trends, which urged man forward along the road to progress, and reactionary trends which fought to

preserve the existing order or even return to the order of the past. The struggle proceeded in accordance with the socio-political struggle, i.e., in accordance with historical progress. The progressive utopias invariably remained overwhelmingly predominant at this stage. At the stage of decline the struggle between the two trends continued, but on the whole utopism became a reactionary force, a force objectively striving to preserve the bourgeois or semi-feudal orders, and resisting the onset of scientific communism under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

Since the socio-economic development of individual countries proceeds at different rates, however, and the conditions for the spread of Marxism in this or that country emerge at different times, the dividing line in the evolution of utopism is not chronologically fixed, but varies according to the rise in the level of social development. As a general rule, this dividing line manifests itself fully when the country in question enters the period of a developed working-class movement: for the countries of Western Europe it appeared in the middle of the 19th century and for Russia about the 1880s.

The examination of the evolution of utopism in the present chapter is confined to the middle of the 19th century. The comparatively full study of the history of socio-political doctrines (particularly utopian socialism) in Marxist literature,¹ makes it unnecessary to give a detailed examination of this process here. We shall, therefore, deal with only a few main points.

As mentioned above, utopian views do not simply vary from one writer to the next, but have definite social roots. Two important points emerge from this: firstly, the question arises of the popular origins of utopias, of folklore with its protest against social injustice and its dreams of a better future as the primary source of utopias. The study of this question, to which A. L. Morton devoted a special chapter in his book *The English Utopia*,² is all the more important as by no means all utopias have been preserved (particularly

¹ See V. A. Dunayevsky and B. F. Porshnev "The Study of West European Utopian Socialism in Soviet Historiography (1917-1963)", *A History of Socialist Doctrines, Collected Articles*, Moscow, 1964; see also *A History of Philosophy*, Vols. I-II, Moscow, 1957.

² See A. L. Morton, *The English Utopia*, London, 1952, pp. 11 et al.

those of antiquity and the Middle Ages), so that those which have survived must be examined not in isolation, but in the light of the development level reached in utopian thought. In this respect the folklore "background" of each epoch is extremely important for a thorough analysis of the work of each utopian writer. Secondly, the level of development of utopian thought depends directly on the level of socio-economic and cultural progress of the country in question. The emergence and flourishing of utopism require a definite minimum level in the development of philosophy and also religious conceptions of the future, in close connection (and opposition) with which utopism develops. At the same time, as history shows, the excessively strong development of religious conceptions of the future under militant clericalism results in utopias being stifled by eschatology, and social convulsions of great force are required to force religion to weaken its ideological grip and open up the way for utopism.

Utopism first flourished in the second half of the first millennium B.C. in the antique world and China, where the level of philosophical thought was extremely high and religion did not oppress it as strongly as in Egypt, Persia and India. The social utopias of Plato, Zeno, Euhemerus, Jambulus, Lao Tzu, Confucius, Mo Ti and other utopian thinkers of the ancient world have long since been accepted in historical literature as specimens of the great accomplishments of utopian thought. Recent studies have revealed more fully the importance of the utopias of Ancient Rome in the first century B.C. and the Taoist utopia in China during the 2nd and 3rd centuries A. D.¹

Utopism in the ancient world is seen to possess the following characteristics.

Contrary to the assertions of R. Pelman and other supporters of the modern trend in bourgeois historiography, there were no utopias of a bourgeois character and certainly

¹ See N. A. Mashkin, "Social Utopias at the time of the Perusine War and Brundisium Treaty" in the book: N. A. Mashkin, *The Principate of Augustus*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1949; S. L. Utchenko, *The Ideological and Political Struggle in Rome on the Eve of the Fall of the Republic*, Moscow, 1952; V. M. Shtein, "The Early History of Social Utopias (The Taoist Utopia in China)" in *Vestnik Istorii Mirovoi Kul'tury*, No. 6, 1960; G. F. Alexandrov, *A History of Sociological Doctrines. The Ancient Orient*. Moscow, 1959.

none of a socialist nature in existence during this period. All the utopias either idealised primitive society (Lao Tzu, Euhemerus, Jambulus), or "rationalised" slave-owning society (Plato) and feudal society (certain late Chinese utopias of this period). This "rationalisation" of slave-owning and feudal societies was conceived as the return in this or that respect to the old order, in the spirit of an idealised tribal system (retaining slave-owning or feudal relations). This is understandable, because the utopias of the ancient world reflected the ideological struggle taking place in the disintegration of primitive society and the establishment of class society. Protest against social oppression, on the one hand, and attempts to extinguish the fire of the class struggle that had broken out, on the other—all this produced pictures of an idealised past as a desirable future.¹

However, even within the period in question, the level of development of utopism did not remain the same. V. P. Volgin points out the substantial difference between utopias of the Hellenist period (from the 3rd century B.C.) and those of the preceding period. Comparing the utopias of Plato and Euhemerus or Jambulus, he writes, we see, in particular, a shift of thought from the organisation of consumption to the organisation of production.² This important process in the development of utopism in the ancient world requires special examination.

Finally, the direct connection of the utopias of the ancient world with the socio-political struggle of that epoch is most evident. Important social reforms, such as those of Lycurgus, Clisthenes, Solon, Agis, Cleomenes and Brothers Gracchus, encouraged the development of utopism, dealing severe blows to presentism and Providentialism, and showing that the existing order could be changed, not by superhuman forces, but by people themselves. It is significant that many of the utopists (including Plato) tried to put their theories into practice. Together with religious ideology, the ideology of utopism helped to inspire a number of popular uprisings, beginning with that of Aristonicus in Pergamum

¹ See V. P. Volgin, *Sketches on the History of Socialism*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935, p. 21; S. L. Utchenko, *The Ideological and Political Struggle in Rome on the Eve of the Fall of the Republic*, pp. 116, 117.

² See V. P. Volgin, *A History of Socialist Ideas*, parts 1-2, Moscow-Leningrad, 1928-1931, pp. 53, 54.

(2nd century B.C.) and ending with the "yellow bands" in China (2nd-3rd centuries A.D.). It is known, for example, that Aristonicus tried to establish on earth the "City of the Sun" which Jambulus described in his utopia.

The second stage in the evolution of utopism is the period of the Middle Ages. The dominance of religious ideology at this stage brought about a sharp decline in the level of utopist thought. Militant clericalism over a period of almost 1,500 years precluded the appearance of any significant social utopia in Europe (including Russia). All that one can detect during this period are isolated elements of utopism in folklore, and also in religious and secular literature. In the 9th to 12th centuries utopian thought in the Near and Middle East showed a certain flourishing which is reflected in the works of Al Farabi, Ibn Bajjah, Ibn Tufail and Nizami.¹ However, the subsequent decline of utopism continued until the mid-19th and early 20th centuries. There was also hardly any progress in utopism up to this time in China, India and other South-East Asian countries.

The third stage in the evolution of utopism is linked with the Renaissance and Enlightenment, covering the period from the 16th to the first third of the 18th century (roughly from Thomas More's *Utopia* to Jean Meslier's *Le Testament* and Voltaire's *Lettres Anglaises ou Philosophiques*). This period is covered comparatively well in Soviet literature.² We shall merely point out that this stage is marked by a strong upsurge of utopism and the appearance of such outstanding utopian writers as Thomas More, Thomas Müntzer, Tommaso Campanella, Francis Bacon, James

¹ H. Simon, "Arabische Utopien im Mittelalter" in *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, S. 245-252; M. Shaginyan, *Nizami's Utopia*, *Izvestia AN SSSR. Literature and language section*, 1947, Vol. VI, No. 4.

² See V. P. Volgin, *French Utopian Communism*, Moscow, 1960; *A History of Socialist Ideas*, parts 1-2, Moscow-Leningrad, 1928-1931; *Sketches on the History of Socialism*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935; and *The Revolutionary Communist of the 18th Century (Jean Meslier and His "Testament")*, Moscow, 1949; A. M. Deborin, *Socio-Political Doctrines of Recent and Very Recent Times* (in three volumes), Moscow, 1958; M. M. Smirin, *The Popular Reformation of Thomas Müntzer and the Great Peasant War*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1947; *Germany at the Time of the Reformation and the Great Peasant War*, Moscow, 1962; B. F. Porshnev, *Meslier (1664-1729)*, Moscow, 1964; *Jean Meslier and the Popular Sources of His World Outlook*, Moscow, 1955.

Harrington, Gerrard Winstanley, Denis Vairasse, Jean Meslier and others. It is interesting to note that utopias of the slave-owning kind finally disappear, and feudal utopias are pushed into the background by bourgeois and socialist ones, the latter predominating. Utopism (together with religious conceptions of the future) becomes the ideology of the bourgeois revolutions of the 16th and 17th centuries.

At first glance, it would seem that there is not any substantial change in the level of utopian thought during this stage. More's utopia is in no way inferior to those of Campanella and Vairasse, nor is Müntzer's to Winstanley's, although they are separated by more than a century. However, this largely correct impression is somewhat one-sided: a more profound analysis shows how utopism gradually gained strength, freeing itself from the grip of eschatology and adapting itself better to the needs of revolutionary struggle (in the case of Winstanley, for example). A direct result of the development of science and technology was the utopia of Francis Bacon, inconceivable earlier, which posed the problem of the connection between social, scientific and technological progress. All this had a considerable influence on subsequent stages in the evolution of utopism.

The fourth stage covers the remaining two-thirds of the 18th century (roughly speaking, from Meslier to Babeuf). It differs from the preceding one basically in the following respects. First of all, one observes a sharp break with religion and its eschatology, which is seen already in Meslier who stands, as it were, on the dividing line between the two stages. Secondly, one finds the use of fine achievements in philosophic thought by the founders of modern West European philosophy (Francis Bacon, Hobbes, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Locke, etc.), whose ideas do not appear in the works of utopian writers until this stage. To the aid of utopism came the ideology of the Enlightenment (Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Holbach, Helvetius, Diderot, Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Jefferson, Franklin, Novikov, Radishchev and others), which began to influence utopian thought even at this stage. Utopias began to assume the more precise character of concrete programmes of political struggle. This applies not only to the utopias of Morelli and Mably, but particularly to those of the French Revolution, above all to Babeuf. Even Rousseau's communal type of utopia in con-

crete socio-political conditions objectively assumes the character of a petty-bourgeois, egalitarian utopia, becoming one of the ideological banners of the revolutionary forces.

Feudal utopias reappear at this stage, which reflects the ideology of the feudal reaction. But bourgeois and particularly socialist utopias remain overwhelmingly predominant.

Finally, the fifth stage covers approximately the first half of the 19th century (from Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen to Blanc, Cabet, Dezamy and Weitling, inclusively Herzen and Chernyshevsky in Russia). Like the preceding one, it has been fairly closely examined in Marxist literature¹. We shall, therefore, again confine ourselves to its main distinctive features. These, to our mind, are the following: attempts at a critical reappraisal of the French Revolution, in the course of which the untenability of utopism became particularly obvious; attempts to link utopism with the incipient movement of the working class (hence the different types of "socialism", the feudal, petty-bourgeois, German, or "true", bourgeois and critical-utopian socialism, mentioned in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*); and attempts to use not only the ideology of the Enlightenment, but also classical philosophy (Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel), and classical bourgeois political economy (Smith, Ricardo, Sismondi and others)—attempts which, like the preceding ones, were unsuccessful until the emergence of Marxism.

All this raised the level of utopian thought considerably. One observes attempts to discover the logic of the further development of society (Saint-Simon), to advance from "ideal", once and for all given pictures of a future society to an original, by no means Chiliastic "history of the future" (Fourier), attempts to link the conceptions of social, scientific and technological progress more deeply than Francis Bacon had done earlier (Saint-Simon, Cabet).

¹ Apart from the works of V. P. Volgin, one might also mention the following: V. M. Dalin, *Gracchus Babeuf on the Eve of and During the French Revolution (1785-1794)*, Moscow, 1963; I. I. Zilberfarb, *The Social Philosophy of Charles Fourier and Its Place in the History of Socialist Thought in the First Half of the 19th Century*, Moscow, 1964; A. R. Ioannissyan, *Charles Fourier*, Moscow, 1958 and *The Genesis of Fourier's Social Ideal*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1939; see also: *From the History of Socio-Political Ideas, Collected Articles*, Moscow, 1955; *A History of Socialist Doctrines*, Moscow, 1962 and 1964.

As a result, utopian thought at this stage of its development exhausted itself, as it were, and faced a crisis. The question of genuine scientific forecasting came to the foreground. Some elements of this forecasting can be found in the works of the great utopians of the West and especially in the works of Herzen and Chernyshevsky.

The role of philosophical conceptions of the historical process in the development of ideas on the future. We have made a separate examination of religious and utopian conceptions of the future only for ease of analysis in this chapter.

In fact, however, they both developed not only in close connection with each other, but equally closely linked with philosophical conceptions of the historical process, the latter serving simultaneously as both the theoretical basis and synthesising generalisation of the other two. The history of the philosophy of history (in the broadest sense—from ancient times to the present day) is a subject of special study of vast complexity. This sphere of the history of development of social thought has been examined far more intensively in Marxist literature than the history of religious thought and social utopias (not falling within utopian socialism),¹ although there are still no special Marxist works dealing with the problem as a whole. Here we shall touch only upon the main trends in the development of conceptions of the historical process and only to the extent to which they have influenced ideas about the future, only as a third connecting component of these views, so to say.

Views of history as a process subject to certain definite laws can be found in embryonic form even in the social thought of the Ancient Orient. By the middle of the first millennium B.C. these ideas had already assumed the character of philosophical systems, and over the following centuries there grew up (originally in a primitive form, naturally) all three conceptions of the historical process which still exist to this day: the conception of the degradation of mankind from some sort of the "Golden Age" in ancient times to the decline and approaching collapse of human culture; the conception of the cyclic development of

¹ See G. G. Aslanyan, *The Idea of Progress in Bourgeois Philosophy of History*, Yerevan, 1965, and the bibliography appended to this work.

the historical process—the endless rises and falls of human culture in an endless rotation of one and the same stages of development; and finally, the conception of progressive development from the lower to the higher, the latter, it is true, in a most primitive, embryonic form, which is generally seen as the ascendant stage in the development of the given cycle.

The view of present events as a stage in the eternal evolution of the world in the past, present and future is found in early Indian, early Chinese and early Greek philosophy of the middle of the first millennium B.C. It appears in the teaching of the philosophical schools of the Chārvākas and particularly the Sāṅkhya in India (7th century B.C.), and in the teaching of Lao Tzu, Confucius, Plato and Aristotle. As far back as c. 800 B.C. in Greece Hesiod expounded in mythological form the conception of regression from the "Golden Age". Plato and Aristotle, Mencius (372-289) and Ssu-ma Ch'ien (145-86) developed the conception of cycles, trying to discover the laws behind the origin of each cycle and to find the factors determining this process (geographical, economic, and juridical), here, on earth, regardless of the "will of the Gods".¹ From the conception of the "Golden Age" there emerged the theory of the natural state which served as a new stimulus for utopism.² This conception, developed by the philosophical school of the Cynics and later the Stoics, was opposed by the schools of the Sophists, and subsequently of Democritus and Epicurus, which proclaimed the idea of social progress.³ Both the Stoics and Epicureans came up against the problem of determinism in the historical process, and the latter developed the theory of the social contract which, in itself, was an encroachment upon the then prevalent idea of Providentialism.⁴

¹ See G. F. Alexandrov, *A History of Sociological Doctrines. The Ancient Orient*, pp. 290, 339, 416-428 (in Russian); W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, London, 1952, p. 325 et al.; A. B. Ranovich, *Hellenism and Its Historical Role*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1950, pp. 303, 308 (in Russian).

² See V. P. Volgin, *Sketches of the History of Socialism*, p. 24.

³ See N. A. Mashkin, "The Age of Lucretius", in the book: *Lucretius. De Rerum Natura. Articles and Commentaries*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1947, p. 257 et al. (in Russian); A. B. Ranovich, *Hellenism and Its Historical Role*, p. 303; H. Becker, H. E. Barnes, *Social Thought from Lore to Science*, Vol. 2, Washington, 1962, p. 429.

⁴ See W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, p. 325.

The conception of cycles was developed in such detail in the works of Polybius (3rd-2nd centuries B.C.) that some Western historians of sociology regard all subsequent theories of this kind right up to Gumplowicz, Pareto, Spengler, Pitirim Sorokin and Toynbee as nothing but a rehash of his views. In Roman philosophy the conception of the "Golden Age", which continued to occupy a dominant position (Seneca, Cicero, Virgil, Tibullus and Ovid), was strongly challenged by the idea of social progress developed by Lucretius in his poem *De Rerum Natura*. Lucretius tried not only to draw up a complete picture of the historical process as the development from the lower to the higher, but also to find out that people's needs, their experience and culture are the motive forces of progress.¹

The philosophical views of Democritus, Epicurus and Lucretius represented a great advance in the development of antique thought. It was no accident that the conceptions of regress and cycles dominated antique thought: the former proceeded from observing the painful process of the disintegration of the tribal system and the fierce social struggle accompanying the establishment of a class society; the latter was determined by the very slow pace of historical progress in the ancient world, for the complex zigzags of social development were naturally perceived as endlessly recurring cycles. An extremely high level of philosophical thought was needed in order to distinguish the line of progress behind the complex peripeteia of history.

The militant clericalism of the Middle Ages stifled for a long time all conceptions of historical development except that of regress—regress by virtue of man's "Fall from Grace" and by Divine predestination, regress which was to culminate in the "end of history" and the transition to the completely different state of the world beyond the grave.² Only towards the end of this period does one catch a new glimmering of the idea of progress (technical) in Roger Bacon and a new, more profound treatment of the concep-

¹ See V. I. Svetlov, "The World Outlook of Lucretius", in the book: *Lucretius. De Rerum Natura. Articles and Commentaries*, Vol. 2, pp. 106, 110.

² See V. I. Gerye, *The Philosophy of History from Augustine to Hegel*, Moscow, 1915, pp. 5-10; H. Becker, H. E. Barnes, *Social Thought from Lore to Science*, Vol. 2, pp. 433-436.

tions of cycles by Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406), who again tried to solve the problem of historical determinism by studying the influence of geographical and other factors.

The age of the Renaissance again brought the conceptions of cycles and progress to the fore. The former was developed in the writings of Machiavelli (1469-1527) and particularly Vico (1668-1744), who still refers to Divine providence, but at the same time grasps the idea that by force of objective laws, which exist independently of human will, all peoples without exception pass through definite stages of development, which he saw not as circles, but as spirals.¹ The latter conception gradually gained even more influence, finding eminent supporters in Bodin and Montaigne, Francis Bacon and Descartes, Spinoza and Fontenelle, Leibnitz and Lessing. A fierce dispute broke out among the thinkers in this trend between those who tried to explain progress as before, by Divine providence (Bodin, Leibnitz and Lessing), and those who in effect rejected the idea of Providentialism, seeking the roots of progress in material factors (Montaigne, Francis Bacon, Descartes and Spinoza).

The clericals (Bossuet and others) sought in vain to defend Providentialism. The Encyclopaedists, particularly Voltaire, dealt them blow upon blow. Voltaire marked the beginning of the development of the philosophy of history in the true sense of the term. The idea of progress broke out the fetters of Providentialism with growing intensity. Turgot, Condorcet, and Godwin explained progress not as Divine providence, but as the perfection of human reason. Turgot sought to prove the inevitability of progress by the influence not only of geographical but also biological and psychological factors. Condorcet referred to scientific and industrial advance, population growth and the development of political institutions. Godwin emphasised the unlimited capacities for the development of human reason.² Increasingly extensive use was made of the theories of natural condition and historical determinism to support the conception of progress. This conception became one of the most important components of the ideology of the French Revolution. The direct connection between these views and the pictures of

¹ See *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1957, pp. 462-463.

² H. Becker, H. E. Barnes, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 470-477.

a happy future which were painted by the great utopists in the first half of the 19th century is obvious.

It would, however, be incorrect to depict the development of the philosophy of history in the second half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th century simply as the triumph of the conception of progress over the dogmas of Providentialism. The process was far more complex. Not only did the champions of the idea of progress encounter growing resistance from the theological reaction (Joseph de Maistre, Louis Bonald and others), who challenged the legality of this idea in principle. The main point was that the idealist world outlook of the great philosophers and historians of that period who worked out the conception of progress contained a very curious intertwining of providentialist and anti-providentialist views.

Thus, Herder looked for objective laws in the development of society, but reduced them simply to geographical factors, accepting the decisive influence of God on the fate of mankind. As a result he saw human development as a process rooted in nature, but sought to reconcile this somehow with the idea of Providentialism. He proclaimed the continuity of progress and at the same time tried to reconcile it with the conception of cyclic development.¹

The influence of the religious view on the historico-philosophical conceptions of Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel is well known. Kant's ideas of social progress and the laws of social development are mixed up with ideas of a teleological nature, and the essence of the matter is not changed by the fact that in place of Divine providence we find here a "plan of nature" which is carried out in the course of human history.² The historico-philosophical views of Fichte, who tried to reconcile the conception of progress with the most reactionary socio-political principles,³ were highly contradictory. Schelling's thesis that man "can and must create his own history himself" exists alongside his other thesis that history is the "revelation of the absolute".⁴

¹ See *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. II, pp. 20-21; H. Becker, H. E. Barnes, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 416.

² See *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. II, pp. 34-54; H. Becker, H. E. Barnes, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 481-486.

³ See *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. II, p. 63.

⁴ See V. I. Gerye, *The Philosophy of History from Augustine to Hegel*, pp. 154, 158.

Engels devoted two special works to an examination of how Schelling's "seething mind" was threshing about in the "snare of religion".¹ The imprint of eschatology is clearly apparent in the philosophy of history of Hegel, who acknowledged progress in the past, but refused to acknowledge it in the present and future, and who saw world history as "the highest manifestation of the world spirit", but regarded the Prussian monarchy as the peak of socio-political development.²

In spite of these contradictions, understandable for that period, the importance of the philosophy of Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel for the views on the future is enormous. The element of utopism in their works was considerable, as is well known. Kant and Fichte were the authors of detailed utopias. Nevertheless as utopists these thinkers played a comparatively secondary role in the development of ideas on the future, but as philosophers their role in it is one of primary importance. They made a great contribution to the methodology of analysing the historical process as a law-governed and dialectical one (seen, it is true, still from an idealist viewpoint), which played a great role in the emergence of scientific forecasting from the viewpoint of historical materialism. Particularly great in this respect were the services of Hegel, given special mention by Engels.³

Prerequisites for the scientific forecasting of the future. Towards the middle of the 19th century the social utopias, above all utopian socialism, reached a stage in their development at which it became possible to turn from utopian pictures to a scientific study of the prospects for human development. Philosophy (including the philosophy of history) discovered the dialectical laws of the development of nature and society, and substantiated the conception of historical progress (still from an idealist viewpoint). Political economy came very close to discovering the decisive role of economics, social production, in human progress. Apart from this, great discoveries in the natural sciences revealed a completely

¹ See F. Engels, "Schelling and Revelation; Schelling, Philosopher in Christ, or the Transfiguration of Worldly Wisdom into Divine Wisdom", K. Marx, F. Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, *Ergänzungsband*, 2er Teil.

² See *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. II, pp. 78-112; V. I. Gerye, op. cit., p. 168; H. Becker, H. E. Barnes, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 499.

³ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 34.

different picture of creation and historical progress from what had been drawn before. Finally, historical science had by this time succeeded in systematising the basic facts of world history and describing such an important factor in historical progress as class contradictions and class struggle in society.

All this at the given level of economic and cultural development in a period when class contradictions had become very acute and the working-class movement much stronger led to the emergence of the truly scientific dialectico-materialist sociology of Marx and Engels with its logically based theory of historical progress, embracing the economic, social, political, intellectual and moral progress of society.

Chapter 2

MARXIST-LENINIST SCIENTIFIC FORECASTING

As has already been shown in the preceding chapter, mankind has been striving for many centuries to predict the future, but before the emergence of Marxism these predictions were utopian and fantastic.

Brilliant guesses, the high soaring of creative thought and the accumulated wealth of factual material and valuable observations were combined, right up to the first half of the 19th century, with naive dreams and idealistic ideas about the nature of social relations.

It was only when the working class entered the historical arena, with the capitalist mode of production in existence, and a scientific theory of social development was elaborated, that there arose the real possibility of predicting the main tendencies and features of the society of the future.

More than a century ago Marx and Engels discovered the objective dialectic of social development and changed socialism from a utopia into a science. They discovered the dialectic of the development of the working class, its transformation from a "class in itself" to a "class for itself", the dialectic of the transition from the stage of its development when it has not yet realised its basic interests and was fighting for a partial improvement of its position to the new stage when the working-class movement is consciously struggling to destroy capitalism and set up its own political power.

By generalising socio-historical practice in general and the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in particular, by generalising the whole store of knowledge about the past and present of society, nature and epistemology, and critically adapting the Hegelian dialectic, Marx and Engels not only explained the most important stages in human history, but also scientifically predicted the course of its future development. It should be emphasised, in particular, that generalising the practical revolutionary activity of the working class was of prime importance for the formation and development of Marxist theory because this practice coincided with the operation of the objective laws of social development. Thus, theoretical generalisation of the socio-historical practice of the proletariat also means understanding the nature of the historical process and is one of the prerequisites for authentic forecasting of the most important stages in the future history of mankind.

Engels pointed out that "to the crude conditions of capitalist production and the crude class conditions corresponded crude theories", for the theoretical thought of each era is its historical product. Thus, it is no accident that the eminent socialists of the pre-Marxist period were utopians, they attempted to evolve "the solution of the social problems, which as yet lay hidden in undeveloped economic conditions ... out of the human brain".¹ Depending on their productive forces people create corresponding production relations and also ideas and categories, i.e., abstract, ideal expressions of these social relations.

In the new historical conditions Marx and Engels adopted a materialist approach to problems of history. They did not stop at 18th-century materialism, but created a new type of materialism—dialectical materialism. They were the only thinkers to rescue dialectics from German idealist philosophy and apply it to the materialist interpretation of nature and history.

Lenin wrote that by deepening and developing philosophical materialism Marx carried it to completion and extended its cognition of nature to cognition of human society.

The materialist interpretation of history became possible

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 119.

only thanks to dialectics, which is why Marx, Engels and Lenin paid so much attention to revising Hegelian dialectics. "What distinguished Hegel's mode of thought from that of all other philosophers", wrote Engels, "was the tremendous sense of the historical upon which it was based. Abstract and idealist though it was in form, yet the development of his thoughts always proceeded parallel with the development of world history and the latter was really meant to be only the test of the former. If, thereby, the real relation was inverted and stood on its head, nevertheless, the real content entered everywhere into the philosophy.... This epoch-making conception of history was the direct theoretical premise for the new materialist outlook..."¹

By his materialist interpretation and revision of Hegel and by creating dialectical materialism, Marx discovered "the great law of motion of history, the law according to which all historical struggles, whether they proceed in the political, religious, philosophical or some other ideological domain, are in fact only the more or less clear expression of struggles of social classes, and that the existence and thereby the collisions, too, between these classes are in turn conditioned by the degree of development of their economic position, by the mode of their production and of their exchange determined by it".²

Marx demonstrated that society is the product of human interaction, that people are not free in the choice of the productive forces which form the basis of all their history, since all productive forces are the product of preceding activity. He wrote that "the social history of men is never anything but the history of their individual development, whether they are conscious of it or not. Their material relations are the basis of all their relations. These material relations are only the necessary forms in which their material and individual activity is realised."³

Engels foresaw that the development of machine production, invention and discovery, and the hitherto unprecedented growth in the productivity of human labour would create a conflict from which modern capitalist economy would

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1969, pp. 512-13.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 396-97.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 518.

eventually perish. "On the one hand are immeasurable riches and a superfluity of products which the purchasers cannot cope with; on the other hand, the great mass of society proletarianised, turned into wage-workers, and precisely for that reason made incapable of appropriating for themselves this superfluity of products.... This state of affairs becomes daily more absurd and—more unnecessary. It *must* be abolished, it *can* be abolished."¹

For Marx and Engels socialism and communism were the logical result of the changes taking place in existing reality in conformity with certain laws.

They wrote: "Communism is for us not a *state of affairs* which is to be established, an *ideal* to which reality [will] have to adjust itself. We call communism the *real* movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premises now in existence".²

The classics of Marxism not only reached a scientifically based conclusion on the inevitability of the revolutionary replacement of capitalism by socialism, but also devoted all their lives to explaining the ways and means for transforming this historical possibility into reality.

As well as developing the scientific theory of socialism and communism they took part personally in the revolutionary struggle of the working class, whose acknowledged leaders they were for many years.

It must be remembered, however, that Marx and Engels did not develop in detail either the theory of the socialist revolution or the theory of building a socialist society. "All that we knew," wrote Lenin, "all that the best experts on capitalist society, the greatest minds who foresaw its development, exactly indicated to us was that transformation was historically inevitable and must proceed along a certain main line, that private ownership of the means of production was doomed by history, that it would burst, that the exploiters would inevitably be expropriated."³

The further development of Marxist theory is indissolubly linked with Lenin. From the very beginning of his revolutionary activity Lenin organically combined loyalty to the

¹ Ibid., p. 149.

² K. Marx, F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, p. 48.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 410.

basic scientific principles of Marxism with their creative application in new historical conditions. He bequeathed mankind some unsurpassed examples of creative Marxism. Lenin represents a whole epoch of human history.

Lenin always regarded the dialectics as the soul, the decisive factor in Marxism, and consequently he devoted great effort to developing it further. He saw it as a condition for the correct scientific analysis of new historical data. He organised the struggle of the masses to create the right conditions to realise Marx's and Engels' predictions and made his own brilliant forecasts about the future of mankind.

Marx defined the objective material-economic and socio-economic conditions for the proletarian revolution. These are the conflict between productive forces and obsolete bourgeois production relations which fetter the development of productive forces, and the antagonism between the social nature of labour and the private form of appropriating the results of labour. This antagonistic contradiction finds expression in the bitter class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Consequently, the socialist revolution can triumph only at a certain stage in capitalist development, namely, the stage when its production relations begin to hamper the development of productive forces.

Marx and Engels elaborated the theory of proletarian revolution in the age of pre-monopoly capitalism, when it was still on the ascent. This was the age of comparatively "peaceful" capitalism, when it was able to develop more or less smoothly, seizing new territories and subjecting hundreds of millions of people in these countries to its rule. In this situation Marx and Engels believed that a simultaneous triumph of the socialist revolution throughout the whole world or in the majority of the developed countries was possible, but did not think it could triumph in one country alone. This conclusion, right for its time, was based on a scientific analysis of the development of capitalist society in the pre-monopoly period.

In 1858, Marx put to Engels the following question in his letter: "... on the Continent the revolution is imminent and will immediately assume a socialist character. Is it not bound to be crushed in this little corner, considering that

in a far greater territory the movement of bourgeois society is still in the ascendant?"¹

If a socialist revolution had begun in a single country at that time, there was the real possibility that the capitalists in other countries would ally to suppress it. The reactionary forces of feudal or semi-feudal Eastern Europe were also a vast reserve of counter-revolution.

Thus, in the pre-monopoly period the socialist revolution could only have triumphed if it had taken place simultaneously in all or in the majority of the most developed capitalist countries.

Engels wrote: "...The large-scale industry has equated social development in all civilised countries with the result that everywhere the bourgeoisie and the proletariat have become the two decisive classes of society and the conflict between them became the main conflict of our time. Therefore, the communist revolution will not be only national, it will take place in all civilised countries, that is at least in Britain, America, France and Germany."²

At the same time Marx and Engels predicted that the ascent of capitalist society would be replaced by a period of uneven, spasmodic and catastrophic capitalist development.

This period arrived and was subjected to a profound and comprehensive analysis by Lenin. In his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* he summed up the development of capitalism throughout the world over the fifty years since the publication of Marx's *Capital*. In full accordance with the laws of the emergence, development and decline of capitalism discovered by Marx, Lenin revealed the economic and political nature of imperialism and defined its laws and tendencies of development. He showed that certain basic properties of capitalism had begun to turn into their opposites. Thus, for example, free competition was being replaced by rivalry between monopolistic unions of large capitalists. The monopolies socialised production on a vast scale, but appropriation remained, as before, private and capitalist. Competition that took on the form of rivalry between the

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1955, p. 134.

² K. Marx, F. Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 4, Berlin, 1969, S. 374.

monopolies, became fiercer, and was accompanied by the continued attacks of capital on the working class.

Lenin showed that imperialism is parasitic, decaying and dying capitalism, the eve of the socialist revolution. He wrote: "... monopoly, which grows *out of* capitalism, is *already* dying capitalism, the beginning of its transition to socialism".¹ Lenin's analysis of imperialism demonstrated that the contradictions inherent in capitalism had become extremely acute, that a sharp disproportion had arisen between the different branches of the economy, and that the struggle had grown more fierce in the highly developed capitalist countries between the monopolies who had transcended national boundaries and turned into international unions of large capital which concentrated in its hands whole branches of industry of many countries.

Basing himself on the works of Marx and Engels, which provided scientific proof of the inevitability of the communist revolution, and having made a detailed and comprehensive study of monopoly capitalism and the revolutionary working-class movement, Lenin discovered the law of uneven economic and political development inherent in imperialism. In his article entitled "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe" he wrote: "Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone."²

Lenin's conclusion on the possibility of the victory of socialism in one or several countries was a brilliant new achievement for Marxist science, bearing witness to its creative nature which is incompatible with stagnation of thought, conservatism and dogmatism.

The question of the dialectic of objective and subjective factors occupies an important position in the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution. It was shown that, given the existence of the necessary objective factors, the victory of the socialist revolution is impossible if the subjective factors are not present, if there is no revolutionary proletarian party to educate the working class to take mass revolutionary action, to fight heroically and selflessly

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 107.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 342.

for the great goal—victory over the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

History confirmed this scientific prediction. The working-class movement gained its first victory in Russia alone, where the objective and subjective factors for socialist revolution were present.

In many highly developed capitalist countries a revolutionary situation has still not developed. As a rule, this is linked also with the absence of a subjective factor. One of the leaders of the Communist Party of the United States, William Z. Foster, noted that in spite of the fact that the workers in the United States were struggling determinedly against capitalism they "have not yet drawn the full ideological meaning out of the class war which they themselves are waging.... This is one of the very greatest assets of the employers".¹

Lenin paid special attention to further elaboration of the question of the dialectic of objective and subjective factors in revolution. It was he who produced the theory on the revolutionary situation, its content and regularities of development. He showed that the presence of objective conditions creates only the possibility of revolution, since its victory is obtained solely through the active and purposeful action of people. The revolution can only be victorious when there is a unity of objective conditions and the subjective factor. Speaking of the subjective factor, Lenin stressed that it is connected, first and foremost, with the existence of a revolutionary party of the working class, with a certain level of political consciousness of the masses, and with the support of the revolutionary vanguard by broad sections of the working people.

Lenin wrote as follows about the dialectic of the objective and subjective: "Marxism differs from all other socialist theories in the remarkable way; it combines complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of affairs and the objective course of evolution with the most emphatic recognition of the importance of the revolutionary energy, revolutionary creative genius, and revolutionary initiative of the masses—and also, of course, of individuals,

¹ William Z. Foster, *The Twilight of World Capitalism*, New York, 1949, p. 63.

groups, organisations, and parties that are able to discover and achieve contact with one or another class."¹

Lenin's theory of socialist revolution does not only substantiate the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country. It also shows the increasingly uneven development of capitalism in the era of imperialism, highlights among other things the hegemony of the proletariat in the liberation movement, the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution, the decisive role of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its various forms, and the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin made a profound and comprehensive analysis of monopoly capitalism and came to the conclusion that imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution, that it is dying capitalism in the era of transition to socialism. This scientific prediction of social development has been fully justified.

The course of history has fully confirmed Lenin's conclusion that the basis of the transition from capitalism's first phase to its highest and final one—imperialism—is the concentration of production and the consequent emergence of capitalist monopolies. Lenin's conclusion that monopoly capital is based on pre-monopolistic forms of economy on the scale of the world system of capitalism has also been confirmed.

Lenin maintained that the possibility of world wars would exist as long as there was imperialism. He paid great attention to the role of wars, particularly world war, in the creation of the revolutionary situation, although none of the founders of Marxism linked the victory of the proletariat solely with imperialist wars.

As early as 1887 Engels concluded the inevitability of war on the basis of an analysis of international relations and also of German domestic and foreign policy. He wrote that for Germany this war would be one of unprecedented scale and strength. He calculated that up to ten million soldiers would take part in it and that it would bring destruction to Europe, hunger, epidemics and brutality to both the armies and the civilian population. He also stated that one of the results of this war would be absolutely beyond question:

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 36.

universal exhaustion and the creation of conditions for the final victory of the working class.

In 1918 Lenin wrote as follows about Engels' prediction: "What genius is displayed in this prophecy!... Some of Engels' predictions have turned out differently; and one could not expect the world and capitalism to have remained unchanged during thirty years of frenzied imperialist development. But what is most astonishing is that so many of Engels' predictions are turning out 'to the letter'. For Engels gave a perfectly exact class analysis...."¹

Kaiser Germany did, in fact, unleash the First World War in 1914, bringing about not only its own collapse but also that of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian monarchies and promoting the growth and victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

Lenin and his followers strove unremittingly to avert a world war. Suffice it to mention, for example, Lenin's speeches at the Stuttgart (1907) and Copenhagen (1910) congresses of the Second International, in which he proposed a programme of action against militarism and against the approaching imperialist war. Significant in this respect is the account of the Polish journalist Alfred Maikosen, to whom Lenin said the following in April 1914: "I am doing everything and will do everything within my power right up to the end to prevent mobilisation and war. I do not want millions of workers to destroy one another to pay for the madness of capitalism. Objectively predicting war and, should this disaster be unleashed, striving to turn it to the best possible advantage is one thing. Wanting war and working towards it is something entirely different."²

Lenin's study of the laws of the actual course of the war served as a basis for his prediction that the imperialist war would turn into a civil war, that the chain of imperialism would snap at its weakest links and that one of these links would be Russia. The fact that this prediction came true testifies to the depth of the theoretical analysis with the help of which Lenin, disengaging himself from the accidents of historical development, revealed the long-term tendencies, the laws which he himself called the key to the "self-progression" of all that is.

¹ Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 495.

² *Krasnaya zvezda* (Red Star), August 6, 1965.

— Lenin fully revealed the true nature of the First World War and his slogan “turn the imperialist war into a civil war” played a large part in preparing and carrying out the revolution in Russia.

On the basis of Lenin’s teaching on war, peace and revolution the Bolshevik Party carried out a vast amount of propaganda and practical work among the working class and the peasantry at the front and at home, preparing them to overthrow the power of the landowners and capitalists. Lenin foresaw that a revolution in the course of the imperialist war would be a civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. This was in fact what happened.

“Of course,” he wrote, “there are people who believe that revolution can break out in a foreign country to order, by agreement. These people are either mad or they are provocateurs.... We know that revolutions cannot be made to order, or by agreement; they break out when tens of millions of people come to the conclusion that it is impossible to live in the old way any longer.”¹

In his opening speech at the VII (April) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP(B) in 1917, Lenin said: “The time is approaching when the assertion of the founders of scientific socialism, and the unanimous forecast of the Socialists who gathered at the Basle Congress, that world war would inevitably lead to revolution, is being everywhere proved correct.”²

At the same time the founders of Marxism-Leninism, far from rejecting the possibility of the victory of a proletarian revolution in the absence of world war, stressed in all manner of ways the need to make use of every favourable situation for carrying out a revolution. A victorious proletarian revolution is primarily the result of the internal development of each country, the solution of irreconcilable class contradictions.

It would be difficult to find more vivid confirmation in world history of the power of scientific prediction than the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, whose inevitability was proved by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Marx and Engels devoted a great deal of attention to Russia, carefully following the events taking place there.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 480.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, p. 227.

They are known to have studied the Russian language in order to read Russian sources in the original. They also corresponded with Russian politicians (Annenkov, Kovalevsky, Danielson, Vera Zasulich, Plekhanov and many others), discussing with them the future of Russia, the coming revolution.

Unlike the Narodniks, Marx and Engels proceeded from a scientific analysis of concrete Russian reality. Since there was not yet a fully developed working class in Russia at the time, they expressed alternative ways for the development of the revolution in Russia. On the one hand, there was the possibility of Russia developing along non-capitalist lines in the period of pre-monopoly capitalism. If this were to be realised it was essential that a democratic revolution should take place after a victorious proletarian revolution in the West.

Engels wrote to Tkachov: "If anything can still save Russian communal ownership and give it the chance of turning into a new, truly viable form, it is a proletarian revolution in Western Europe."¹

For their part Marx and Engels did not exclude the possibility that Russia would take the capitalist path of development. In his letter to the editorial office of *Otechestvenniye zapiski* in November 1877, Marx wrote: "If Russia is tending to become a capitalist nation after the example of the West European countries—and during the last few years she has been taking a lot of trouble in this direction—she will not succeed without having first transformed a good part of her peasants into proletarians; and after that, once taken to the bosom of the capitalist regime, she will experience its pitiless laws like other profane peoples."²

Marx and Engels believed that "this time the revolution begins in the East (meaning Russia—*Ed.*), hitherto the unbroken bulwark and reserve army of counter-revolution".³

The Great October Socialist Revolution—the greatest event of the twentieth century—opened up a new era in the history of mankind, the era of socialism and communism, the era of the liberation of peoples from colonial dependence,

¹ *The Correspondence of K. Marx and F. Engels with Russian Political Figures*, Moscow, 1951, p. 204 (in Russian).

² K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, pp. 378-79.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 374.

the era of the collapse of capitalism. Mankind, as Lenin had predicted, "now entered into a new stage of development of extraordinarily brilliant prospects".¹

The leaders of the Second International and other apostates to Marxism, including the Russian Mensheviks and Trotskyites, attempted to prove that a proletarian revolution and the victory of socialism were impossible in Russia, and that only after a victorious proletarian revolution in the West would it be possible for socialism to triumph in Russia. But Lenin's theoretical prediction was borne out completely, being put into practice by the broad masses of the working people led by the Party of the Bolsheviks.

As early as 1915 Lenin advanced the thesis that the socialist revolution "may and probably will consist of many years of fighting, of several periods of onslaught with intervals of counter-revolutionary convulsions of the bourgeois system".²

A few years later the 14th Conference of the RCP(B) passed a resolution stating that Lenin's forecast "is now being fully confirmed by the development of world revolution".³

Many years have passed since the 14th Party Conference. We are now able to cast our mind's eye back over a considerably larger stretch of history and see how the above-mentioned thesis of Lenin's has been corroborated. The USSR and the other socialist countries have repeatedly been subject to onslaughts from capitalism, but the latter always has been and always will be defeated.

Lenin's theory of imperialism and the socialist revolution, which has been further elaborated in the historical documents of the international communist movement, still arms the working class and all progressive forces with knowledge of the laws of development and decline of modern capitalism, and serves as a reliable guide in the fight for socialism and communism.

Advocates of capitalism make great play of temporary, transient achievements in the post-war economic develop-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 498.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 399.

³ *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Its Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 208 (in Russian).

ment of individual capitalist countries, presenting them as a sort of "economic miracle".

Turning to the works of Lenin, however, we find there statements which in one way or another forecast the above-mentioned situations.

Lenin regarded assertions about inevitable stagnation in capitalist production and absence of development in monopoly capital as unscientific. He revealed the existence of contradictory trends inherent in this stage of capitalism, namely, competition and monopoly. The tendency towards decay and stagnation in productive forces, characteristic of all monopolies under private ownership of the means of production, is linked with the tendency of capitalism towards rapid development in individual branches of industry, in individual countries at individual periods. Lenin pointed out the connection between this tendency and competition, the opportunities for which grew with the development of the scientific and technological revolution which makes it possible to lower production costs and increase profit.¹ This contradiction, the struggle between these tendencies, leads either to stagnation or to a temporary boom in a concrete country given certain conditions.

A great deal has taken place in the development of capitalism over the last century, but its basic laws and contradictions remain unchanged, and the teaching on the socialist revolution, far from losing its significance, continues to play an important role in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in its more developed form.

Marx and Engels substantiated the variety of forms and ways of the proletariat gaining political power, which depend on the concrete historical situation. Lenin predicted that all nations would arrive at socialism—this was inevitable—"but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life".²

Given certain conditions, the socialist revolution is inevitably accompanied by an armed uprising, civil war and the military suppression of the exploiters, whereas

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 276; Vol. 23, p. 106.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70.

in other conditions, if the resistance of the exploiting classes is weakened and the strength of the proletariat and its allies is superior to that of the bourgeoisie, and there is a powerful movement of the masses led by the proletariat, the socialist revolution may take on peaceful forms, i.e., it can be carried out without an armed uprising and civil war. The founders of Marxism-Leninism did not rule out the possibility of the proletariat gaining political power by peaceful means.

Marx, Engels and Lenin showed that the abolition of private ownership of the instruments and means of production and their transformation into public, socialist property could be carried out through the expropriation of the expropriators in certain conditions and through various forms of state capitalism or through compensation in others. "We by no means consider compensation as impermissible in any event," wrote Engels, "Marx told me (and how many times!) that, in his opinion, we would get off cheapest if we could buy out the whole lot of them."¹

Developing this theory of Marx's, Lenin wrote: "...Marx was profoundly right when he taught the workers the importance of preserving the organisation of large-scale production, precisely for the purpose of facilitating the transition to socialism. Marx taught that ... the idea was conceivable of *paying the capitalists well*, of buying them out, if the circumstances were such as to compel the capitalists to submit peacefully and to come over to socialism in a cultured and organised fashion, provided they were paid well."²

The peaceful form of the socialist revolution certainly does not mean that no revolutionary force or compulsion is used in relation to the deposed exploiting classes. Addressing the 4th Conference of Moscow Trade Unions and Factory Committees in July 1918, Lenin said that the experience of the October Socialist Revolution was confirming the correctness of the words which always distinguish the representatives of scientific socialism, Marx and his followers, from the utopian socialists, the petty-bourgeois socialists, the socialist intellectuals and the socialist dreamers. "The intellectual dreamers, the petty-bourgeois socialists, thought, and perhaps still think, or dream, that it is possible to

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 474.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 338-39.

introduce socialism by persuasion. They think that the majority of the people will be convinced, and when they become convinced the minority will obey; that the majority will vote and socialism will be introduced. No, the world is not built so happily; the exploiters, the brutal landowners, the capitalist class are not amenable to persuasion." Lenin went on to say that the socialist revolution confirms what everybody has seen—the furious resistance of the exploiters. "The stronger the pressure of the oppressed classes becomes ... the more furious does the resistance of the exploiters become." He points out that the period of transition from capitalism to socialism "will inevitably be a very long one in all countries, because, I repeat, the oppressors retaliate to every success achieved by the oppressed class by fresh attempts at resistance, by attempts to overthrow the power of the oppressed class".¹ Lenin also wrote that "it would be extremely stupid and absurdly utopian to assume that the transition from capitalism to socialism is possible without coercion and without dictatorship. Marx's theory very definitely opposed this petty-bourgeois-democratic and anarchist absurdity long ago".²

The Marxist-Leninist parties led and continue to lead the struggle against the petty-bourgeois, liberal ideas of a peaceful (which they regard as a reformist, not revolutionary) path of transition from capitalism to socialism. The socialist revolution in any form, peaceful or non-peaceful, as it was predicted by the classics of Marxism-Leninism, means the destruction of the political rule of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the abolition of private ownership of the instruments and means of production. Coercive and compulsive methods should be applied to the ruling exploiting classes—such is the objective law of historical development.

The real facts of the present-day situation confirm over and over again that the working class, the consistently revolutionary class in modern society, is the main motive force of the revolutionary transformation of the world.

The Programme of the CPSU rightly stresses that "in fulfilling its historic mission as the revolutionary remaker of the old society and creator of a new system, the working

¹ Ibid., Vol. 27, pp. 465-66.

² Ibid., p. 263.

class becomes the exponent, not only of its own class interests, but of the interests of all working people. It is the natural leader of all forces fighting against capitalism.”¹

The content of the socialist revolution is the gaining of political power by the proletariat and the establishment of its revolutionary dictatorship. Marx, and later Lenin, demonstrated the unity of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the inevitable consequence, the logical result of the victorious socialist revolution.

Lenin predicted that the transition from capitalism to socialism was possible only with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. For suppressing the resistance of the overthrown classes and abolishing them “requires a long, difficult and stubborn *class struggle*, which, *after* the overthrow of capitalist rule, *after* the destruction of the bourgeois state, *after* the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, *does not disappear* (as the vulgar representatives of the old socialism and the old Social-Democracy imagine), but merely changes its forms and in many respects becomes fiercer”.²

The tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat are not simply to suppress the resistance of the exploiting classes both at home and in the international arena (the struggle against military intervention, economic blockades, etc.). Its main task is to set in motion the building of socialism.

Lenin made a profound and comprehensive study of the tasks and functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Developing the Marxist doctrine of the working class as the main social force called upon and competent to build the new society, he showed that organising the new economic relations among people was the main and most difficult task of the proletarian revolution. He persistently stressed that the creation of a socialist economy was the most important task and the most important aspect of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The socialist state, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, unlike the bourgeois state, does not receive any new ready-made economic relations which have formed in the old society, but creates these relations and builds a new,

¹ *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1961, p. 453.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 389.

socialist economic basis. The main function of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as Lenin repeatedly emphasised, is to build a communist society, abolish classes and class distinctions, improve the material position of the workers and educate the new man.

This great historical task of the dictatorship of the proletariat is profoundly humane and full of concern for the human personality and bears no relation whatsoever, for example, to the anti-Marxist accusations that the dictatorship of the proletariat is nothing but naked military coercion.

Lenin showed that the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a short episode, but a whole historical epoch, characterised by the intense class struggle of the proletariat against the overthrown exploiting classes who are attempting to restore the old order.

The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, first and foremost, ensured the defence of the gains of the revolution against the attempts of internal and external enemies with the help of the intervention, civil war, economic blockade, sabotage and kulak terror to return the country to the capitalist camp. As Lenin had predicted, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat also ensured the building of socialism, the transformation of backward Russia into a country with a powerful industry, a highly mechanised agriculture and a high level of scientific and cultural development. Lenin wrote that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only the use of force against the exploiters, and not even mainly the use of force.... The proletariat represents and creates a higher type of social organisation of labour compared with capitalism. This is what is important."¹

The history of socialist transformation in the Soviet Union more than confirms the truth of these statements.

The socialist state is a special type of state, the consolidation and development of which in the course of the building of socialism and communism is bound to lead to the withering away of the state altogether after the victory of communism on a world-wide scale. The withering away of the state is connected with the creation of the necessary economic conditions which preclude the existence of classes and class distinctions and thereby make the existence of the state

¹ Ibid., p. 419.

superfluous. These conditions are the creation of a communist economy and the application of its main principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need".

A most important principle of the socialist state, developed by Lenin, is that of the alliance of the working class and the peasantry with the former taking the leading role. The participation of the broad mass of the working people in solving the tasks of socialist construction and running society is the essence of the socialist state and the expression of the highest type of democracy and freedom.

The opponents of Marxism, including all brands of revisionists and opportunists, have specialised for some time now in contrasting the dictatorship of the proletariat with bourgeois democracy which they attempt to present as true democracy.

Lenin wrote: "The Scheidemanns and Kautskys speak about 'pure democracy' and 'democracy' in general for the purpose of deceiving the people and concealing from them the *bourgeois* character of *present-day* democracy. Let the bourgeoisie continue to keep the entire apparatus of state power in their hands, let a handful of exploiters continue to use the former, bourgeois, state machine! Elections held in such circumstances are lauded by the bourgeoisie, for very good reasons, as being 'free', 'equal', 'democratic' and 'universal'. These words are designed to conceal the truth, to conceal the fact that the means of production and political power remain in the hands of the exploiters, and that therefore real freedom and real equality for the exploited, that is, for the vast majority of the population, are out of the question."¹

Naturally, the proletariat is not indifferent to the methods used by the ruling bourgeoisie. It prefers parliamentarism to fascism, although these are only two different forms of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois parliamentarism is not evidence of popular rule in capitalist countries, whereas the socialist state of the dictatorship of the proletariat whatever form it may take, is the organ of true popular rule, the highest form of democracy.

Lenin repeatedly drew attention to the fact that "in the same way as there can be no victorious socialism that

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 368-69.

does not practise full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy".¹

The proletariat is preparing the whole of mankind for the transition to communism and, therefore, is still struggling in an exploitative society for democracy and political freedoms.

Lenin's idea of the unity of the working-class socialist and democratic tasks has been embodied in the CPSU Programme: "*The struggle for democracy is a component of the struggle for socialism.... In the course of this struggle, Right-wing socialist, reformist illusions are dispelled and a political army of the socialist revolution is brought into being.*"²

Present-day revisionists maintain that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not essential during the transition to socialism of developed capitalist countries which possess bourgeois-democratic traditions. In fact Marxist-Leninist theory predicted, and the experience of building socialism in the USSR and other socialist countries has proved, that the victory of socialism is impossible without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and that this is a universal law applying to all countries without exception. As early as 1920 Lenin wrote: "The question of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the fundamental question of the modern working-class movement in all capitalist countries without exception."³

The contrasting of dictatorship with democracy has been used in bourgeois literature for a long time, but today it has acquired special scope in view of the intensified attempts to discredit the socialist system. Modern capitalist ideologists identify the concept of democracy with the bourgeois state system, and the concept of dictatorship only with the state system of the socialist countries. By so doing they hope to conceal the class nature of bourgeois democracy which they attempt to present as "pure democracy". This old device of the apologists for bourgeois democracy was exposed long ago by Lenin. "If we are not to mock at common sense and history, it is obvious that we cannot speak of 'pure

¹ Ibid., Vol. 22, p. 144.

² *The Road to Communism*, p. 484.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 340.

democracy' as long as different *classes* exist; we can only speak of *class* democracy."¹

In fact bourgeois democracy (which bourgeois ideologists hold to be 'pure') is actually a dictatorship of an exploiter minority, whereas socialist democracy is the dictatorship of the majority of the people over the exploiters and their accomplices.

In the works of many bourgeois writers dealing with this question, the economic and socio-class content of the concepts of dictatorship and democracy are carefully ignored. At the same time these works present the socialist state as a blind instrument of economic necessity, which is said to ignore the freedom of the individual, freedom being interpreted in the anarchist sense and not as recognised necessity, although it is a well-known fact that the idea of living in society and being free of it is a petty-bourgeois utopia.

Only socialism, which abolishes the exploitation of man by man, creates the necessary conditions for the personal freedom of the working people.

The individual's true freedom is when the latter's way of life and cast of mind correspond to the interests of socialist society. Freedom and responsibility to socialist society—this is the integral whole which characterises the individual. Anyone who attempts to put himself above socialist society and state, who violates its law and order, comes into conflict with the interests of the working people and objectively aids the forces hostile to socialism. The free member of a socialist society is not alienated from it, but is a truly creative force in society and state.

A person is free if he understands the laws of socialist society, moulds his life and behaviour in accordance with these objective laws and the interests of other people, and recognises the authority of mass organisations and discipline. The proof of real democracy is true freedom from exploitation, the growth of the activity of the masses, and their participation in running the state, in political and social life.

Socialism has created the most favourable conditions for the development and self-assertion of the individual in work for the benefit of the people. The unselfish work of the members of socialist society, work according to ability, is a neces-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 242.

sary condition for successful advance towards communism.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism pointed out the ways and means of turning communism from a dream into reality. The man of the communist future, which is being created by the generation of today, will be a fully developed individual, and the values created by his labour will go to satisfy material and spiritual requirements.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism predicted that the working class would be able to fulfil its great historic role—of making the proletarian revolution, establishing the dictatorship of the working class, and building socialism and communism—only when its struggle was led by a militant political party armed with scientific revolutionary theory.

Marx and Engels (Engels wrote about this in a letter to Philipp van Patten) took the view that if it was to achieve all the important aims of the future social revolution the proletariat would first have to take into its hands the organised political power of the state and with its help crush the opposition of the capitalist class and reorganise society. They foresaw that one of the ultimate results of the inevitable proletarian revolution would be the withering away and eventual disappearance of political organisation—the state, which had as its main aim in the past to ensure by armed force the economic enslavement of the working majority by the “wealthy minority”.

“... The proletariat cannot conquer its political domination, the only door to the new society, without violent revolution,” wrote Engels. “For the proletariat to be strong enough to win on the decisive day it must—and this Marx and I have been arguing ever since 1847—form a separate party distinct from all others and opposed to them, a conscious class party.”¹

Lenin said that Marx’s theory “made clear the real task of a revolutionary socialist party: not to draw up plans for refashioning society, not to preach to the capitalists and their hangers-on about improving the lot of the workers, not to hatch conspiracies, *but to organise the class struggle of the proletariat and to lead this struggle, the ultimate aim of*

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 492.

*which is the conquest of political power by the proletariat and the organisation of a socialist society."*¹

The experience of the international working-class movement, the victory of socialism in the USSR, the emergence and development of the world socialist system have provided irrefutable proof of the truth of Marx's and Engels' scientific prediction on the role of the political party of the proletariat.

Marx and Engels laid the foundations for the teaching on the proletarian party. They saw the proletarian party as the leading, conscious and organised vanguard of the working class.

Marx firmly opposed both the proletarian party becoming bogged down in the petty-bourgeois mass and sectarian narrow-mindedness in interpreting the class aims of the proletariat and the activity of the proletarian party. Communists should create a broad democratic front of struggle against the bourgeoisie and form the political army of the socialist revolution. Marx carried on the struggle on two fronts: against Right-wing opportunism and "Left"-wing petty-bourgeois adventurism. Lenin pointed out that Marx strongly condemned the revolutionary phraseology of the "Left" and simultaneously subjected the opportunists of the Right to merciless criticism.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism showed that the total liberation of the working class and all working people from exploitation by capital was possible only if the political power of the bourgeoisie was overthrown. In order to achieve this the working class must unite, understand its tasks and learn to conduct an organised struggle. The unity of the working class can be ensured only by a political party whose aims are to form the proletariat into a class, overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie and win political power for the proletariat. But history has shown that not all political parties of the working class can ensure the achievement of these goals. The Social-Democratic parties of Western Europe, which broke with Marxism in the late 19th and early 20th century, turned out to be conciliatory and reformist. Instead of organising the proletariat to fight they urged it to co-operate and be reconciled with its oppressors. They could not fulfil the role of leader of the working class.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 210-11.

Basing himself on the ideas of the founders of Marxism and on a scientific study and generalisation of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, Lenin concluded that only a party armed with Marxist theory, with knowledge of the laws of social development, a party strong not only in community of ideological views, but also in its organisational unity, conscious discipline and solidarity with the broad mass of the working people, could carry out the role of leader of a victorious socialist revolution. Lenin showed that the Communist Party is the highest form of the class organisation of the proletariat, called on to exert an ideological influence on and lead all its mass organisations.

Lenin foresaw that "only the political party of the working class, i.e., the Communist Party, is capable of uniting, training and organising a vanguard of the proletariat and of the whole mass of the working people that alone will be capable of withstanding the inevitable petty-bourgeois vacillations of this mass and the inevitable traditions and relapses of narrow craft unionism or craft prejudices among the proletariat, and of guiding all the united activities of the whole of the proletariat, i.e., of leading it politically, and through it, the whole mass of the working people. Without this the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible".¹ He stressed that the party is "the vanguard of the proletariat, capable of assuming power and *leading the whole people* to socialism, of directing and organising the new system, of being the teacher, the guide, the leader of all the working and exploited people in organising their social life without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie".²

In the bitter struggle with various opportunists, Lenin developed and defended the organisational principles of building a party of the new type. These principles, first and foremost that of democratic centralism, are of an international significance in that they correspond to the very essence of the Communist parties and ensure that they carry out their historic mission. Broad democracy inside the Party, freedom of opinion in the discussion of all questions, criticism, self-criticism and iron discipline after a decision has been taken by the will of the majority—these are the standards of conduct within the Leninist Party.

¹ Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 246.

² Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 404.

Lenin stressed particularly firmly that "whoever brings about even the slightest weakening of the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during its dictatorship), is actually aiding the bourgeoisie against the proletariat".¹

He concentrated attention on the fact that "the Party is a voluntary association, which would inevitably break up, first ideologically and then physically, if it did not cleanse itself of people advocating anti-Party views. And to define the border-line between Party and anti-Party there is the Party programme, the Party's resolutions on tactics and its rules...."²

On Lenin's initiative the 10th Congress of the Communist Party passed a special resolution "On Party Unity" which read, in part, as follows: "It is essential that all conscious workers should be fully aware of the harm and inadmissibility of the slightest degree of factionalism, which would inevitably lead to a weakening of team work and to stronger repeated attempts by enemies who stick to the governmental party to broaden the rift and exploit it for the aims of counter-revolution."³

The Party of the Bolsheviks was constantly fortifying itself, driving from its ranks the factionalists, dissenters, opportunists and other anti-Party elements, and thereby ensuring the necessary unity.

In the course of the struggle to build socialism the Communist Party of the Soviet Union defeated all the anti-Leninist groups and trends—Trotskyites, Zinovievites, "Left-wing Communists", "workers' opposition", Right-wing opportunists and other deviationists. This struggle was due to the objective conditions of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

The experience of the Soviet Communist Party in the first place has confirmed Lenin's forecast that it is possible to retain the victory won by the working class and ensure the building of socialism only if there is a political party of the working class, which is characterised by unity of thought and action, and which strengthens itself in the course

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 45.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 10, p. 47.

³ *The CPSU in Resolutions...*, p. 528.

of the decisive struggle with factionalists and opportunists.

Forces hostile to Marxism-Leninism know only too well that the internal unity of Communist and Marxist Workers' parties is the basis of their successful revolutionary struggle, the cornerstone in the whole system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and they spare no effort in trying to destroy this unity.

The former American Ambassador to the Soviet Union, John Kennan, wrote what if anyone should ever succeed in destroying the unity and strength of the CPSU, Soviet Russia could be quickly changed from one of the strongest to one of the weakest national societies.

That which no one has ever succeeded or will ever succeed in doing to the CPSU and the Soviet Union, the ideological opponents of Marxism-Leninism are attempting to carry out in relation to other Communist and Workers' parties.

Under the guise of the creative development of Marxism-Leninism, those people in the communist movement who express the hopes of the bourgeoisie are spreading the idea that after the victory of the socialist revolution the Communist Party loses its leading role. In their opinion, it is only one of a number of organisations together with youth, trade union and other organisations, and its functions should be limited to educating the masses. They also advance ideas aimed against the principle of democratic centralism talking of the need for factions within Marxist parties and even the creation of opposition Communist parties in places where they are the guiding force. It may be that some of the authors of these views sincerely think that they are developing Marxism, but objectively ideas of this type, regardless of their authors' subjective intentions, are hostile to Marxism and are the practical embodiment of the most cherished hopes of capitalist ideologists.

For true Communists the world over the shining examples of relentless struggle against Party enemies are Lenin's struggle for the unity of the Party of the Bolsheviks, his struggle on an international scale in the Third, Communist International created at his initiative, and the struggle of the CPSU for the unity and solidarity of the world communist and working-class movement on the basis of truly creative Marxism-Leninism.

The "Right" and "Left" in the modern working-class movement are continuing the petty-bourgeois vacillations typical of their predecessors.

Lenin wrote: "This wavering flows in two 'streams': petty-bourgeois reformism, i.e., servility to the bourgeoisie covered by a cloak of sentimental democratic and 'Social'-Democratic phrases and fatuous wishes; and petty-bourgeois revolutionism—menacing, blustering and boastful in words, but a mere bubble of disunity, disruption and brainlessness in deeds."¹ The history of the struggle of the Marxists-Leninists against the revisionism of the Right and "Left" on a world-wide scale has confirmed and continues to confirm Lenin's assessment.

Both "Left" and Right revisionists are drawing increasingly closer together in the struggle against scientific communism. The Right-wing revisionists and those of the "Left" are united by their desire to replace international Leninist teaching by various versions and "models" of "national", "democratic" and other types of socialism, which in fact means embracing bourgeois nationalism and moving in the direction of open anti-communism.

Lenin paid special attention to the relation between the national and the international in the activity of the Communist parties. "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism," he wrote, "and this is—working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle*, this, and only this, line, in *every* country without exception."² He also wrote: "We recognise the duty of comradeship, the duty to support all comrades, the duty to tolerate the opinions of comrades, *but as far as we are concerned, the duty of comradeship derives from our duty to Russian and international Social-Democracy and not vice versa.*"³

The Leninist interpretation of internationalism is based on a consistently class, proletarian approach to the analysis of the communist and working-class movement. Every Communist or Workers' party is responsible for the fate

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 21.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, p. 75.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 266.

of its country and the whole international communist and working-class movement. It cannot be "neutral" towards the defence of socialist gains, and of the security and international positions of the socialist countries.

Guided by Leninism and creatively developing it in the new historical conditions, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union combines internationalism with patriotism, gives active support to the whole international working-class movement and the national liberation and anti-imperialist struggle, and organises the building of communism in the USSR.

Lenin foresaw that the victory of the proletarian revolution and the successful building of socialism and communism in the USSR would be of great international importance. He said that the USSR would exert its main influence on the course of world events by its economic achievements. This scientific prediction has been confirmed by subsequent events.

Lenin saw after the victory of the October Revolution the gap between the historical magnitude of the tasks being carried out by the Party and the economic backwardness of Russia, devastated by the imperialist and civil wars, its material and cultural poverty, but he also saw Russia's tremendous potential, her natural riches, and the great creative power of her people which had been awakened by the activities of the Party of the Bolsheviks, and therefore, he predicted that the contradiction between the grandiose nature of the tasks being tackled and Russia's backwardness would be successfully overcome. This prediction, like so many of Lenin's predictions, subsequently came true.

Today the Soviet Union has reached unprecedented heights in the development of its economy, culture, science and technology, and as the country which is building a communist society it leads the whole of mankind. The achievements of the USSR are the embodiment of the activity of the Leninist Communist Party which was and is the organising and cementing force that ensures the splendid triumphs of socialism.

Lenin's prediction that the victory of socialism is impossible without a party tempered in battle, enjoying the trust and support of the masses and able to sense their mood and influencing them has been justified.

The accuracy and reliability of Marxist-Leninist scientific prediction has been proved by the events of man's history and cannot be refuted. But the ideological opponents of the theory of scientific communism have not laid down their weapons. They are now attempting to cast doubt on the ability of Marxist-Leninist science to predict social development in the scientific and technological revolution.

It is a well-known fact that Marxist-Leninist scientific forecasting is based on the cognised laws and tendencies of social development. Today, as the role of mathematics increases in the development of all the sciences, one hears objections that since Marxist theory is not expressed in the language of mathematical symbols, its forecasts cannot claim to be accurate and reliable.

But the accuracy of scientific forecasting is determined primarily by the accuracy with which the objective laws of reality are reflected in scientific laws, i.e., in the final analysis by the level of development of practice, which is a source of knowledge and a criterion of truth.

Often by accuracy in science is meant the possibility of expressing this or that result in the form of mathematical symbols and functional dependencies. People with little knowledge of mathematics, or mathematicians who are uncritical of their science, make a fetish of these indisputably important aspects of mathematics. At the same time, however, they frequently ignore the price that has been paid for this accuracy, i.e., limitations and idealisations of, and abstractions from, multi-faceted reality, which, in turn, if the use of mathematics is not checked against actual practice, may lead to faulty conclusions. Hegel, who had an excellent knowledge of mathematics for his time, was right in a sense when he said that "mathematics is a precise science because it is a scant science". But this does not mean, of course, that Hegel underestimated the role of mathematics. He held it in high esteem, as did the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx's *Mathematical Manuscripts* bear witness to his extensive study of the science.

Marx and Engels, in their study of social development, had recourse to mathematics and used statistics, but they never made a fetish of it.

Statistical methods should be used when one is dealing with mass phenomena but, unfortunately, the statistics that are used in these cases do not yet take due account of the qualitative characteristics of the elements of sets. Therefore one can say in advance that the accuracy of predictions obtained on this basis, i.e., with the help of mathematics, will be limited.

Hence the need for further development of mathematics which is used in analysing social phenomena and which takes into account the qualitative distinctions of social objects at least in the same way as quantum statistics takes into account such a characteristic of micro-objects as spin. The penetration of mathematics into social sciences is a great achievement. It is essential that this important trend should be developed in all possible ways and that conditions should be created for consolidating further the creative cooperation of social scientists with mathematicians, cyberneticists and representatives of other sciences, but it would be wrong to reduce the question of scientific forecasting to the mathematization of the social sciences.

Lenin rightly called statistics a most powerful means of acquiring social knowledge.¹ But he also warned researchers against formal, undialectical use of statistical material and methods. It is enough to recall his criticism of the bourgeois sociologist Pitirim Sorokin in his article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism". Lenin draws attention here to the fact that it is formalism that hampers bourgeois sociology wallowing in empiricism. He wrote that bourgeois statistics "of late have been suffering increasingly from what I would call 'statistical cretinism'—an inability to see the wood for the trees; *economic types* of phenomena are submerged in a welter of figures"....² The Leninist method of preliminary typological grouping is of special importance in sociological studies on forecasting. Lenin regarded the main task of typological grouping as explaining the essence of social groups and class distinctions. His numerous works

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 437.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 85.

bear witness to this, in particular, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, *New Data on the Laws Governing the Development of Capitalism in Agriculture*, *The Economic Content of Narodism* and others. It is not enough to have statistical facts at your disposal. It is necessary to be able to make a truly scientific analysis, and this is possible on the basis of a profound, creative mastery of Marxist-Leninist methodology and mathematical methods. Quantitative analysis without qualitative, social analysis cannot provide an adequate basis for scientific forecasting of social phenomena.

Thus, we see that the application of mathematical methods alone does not and cannot guarantee accurate scientific forecasts.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism were quite right in drawing attention to the fact that it is not the duty of the social sciences to predict all individual events and their details. This aspect of Marxism was frequently stressed by Lenin. Thus, for example, he wrote: "The sum total of these (social—*Ed.*) changes in all their ramifications in the capitalist world economy could not be grasped even by seventy Marxes...."¹

In September 1917, Lenin wrote: "We do not claim that Marx knew or Marxists know the road to socialism down to the last detail. It would be nonsense to claim anything of the kind. What we know is the direction of this road, and the class forces that follow it; the specific, practical details will come to light only through the *experience of the millions* when they take things into their own hands."² But scientific prediction does make it possible to single out from the variety of tendencies and phenomena the main ones which are decisive at the given stage of historical development. The forms in which these leading tendencies manifest themselves may be very varied, but their essence is the same.

A scientific forecast is a logical conclusion proceeding from correct initial propositions or premises. A profound knowledge of reality in all its direct and indirect relationships is the first stage on the path of scientific forecasting. It can be truly scientific only when the whole line of thought

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 325.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 25, p. 281.

is logically faultless, conclusive and strictly consistent. Many dangers lurk along the way, not the least of which are logical errors. The latter include, for example, unsubstantiated generalisations on the basis of which far-reaching forecasts are made. By unsubstantiated generalisations we mean ones which are based on a few facts, sometimes even a single fact, with conclusions drawn relating to a whole group of phenomena. Here, too, we include the automatic extension of general propositions to individual cases without sufficient analysis of the possibility for such an extension. Lenin wrote that "any truth, if 'overdone' (as Dietzgen Senior put it), if exaggerated, or if carried beyond the limits of its actual applicability, can be reduced to an absurdity, and is even bound to become an absurdity under these conditions".¹

Correct forecasting is also impossible when the causal relationship of phenomena is replaced by their simple succession in time.

Logical errors also include incorrect usage of the method of analogy. Conclusions by analogy are correct only when account is taken of the qualitative characteristics determining the specific interaction of each of the objects or phenomena being compared. An analogy based on the similarity of certain external immaterial aspects of objects or phenomena, is not scientific and leads to error.

Only by using knowledge which reflects objective reality, by strictly logical conclusions and by a dialectico-materialist analysis of the concrete situation can one hope to forecast (with a certain degree of accuracy) something new in science or another sphere. Such an approach to the forecasting of the future is optimistic and inspires one to fathom the unfathomed.

* * *

The scientific forecasting of social development has been strikingly embodied in the Programmes of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Whereas the first Programme of the Bolsheviks, adopted in 1903, pointed to the need to bring about the victory of the proletarian revolution and

¹ Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 62.

the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class, and the second (adopted in 1919) to the need for building socialism, the third Programme (1961) speaks of the building of communism. All three define the aim and the means of attaining this aim on the basis of scientific forecasting of the main tendencies of the future.

The successful achievement of the aims set in the first two CPSU Programmes testifies to the reliability of Marxist-Leninist scientific forecasting. The third CPSU Programme—the programme of building communism in the USSR—is fresh confirmation of the power of Marxist-Leninist scientific forecasting based on profound knowledge of the laws of modern social development.

Scientific forecasting is not an aim in itself for Marxists. It is essential not only to foresee the future, but also to ensure that it arrives. The most important programme containing scientifically substantiated characteristic features and indications of the future can play its role in the life of society only when it becomes a guide to the action of the masses, a programme of struggle against the forces of the old which are impeding the establishment of the new. The best scientific forecasting, the most detailed and perfect plans, may come to naught if their implementation is not organised.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU demonstrated convincingly that the strength of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union lies not only in the fact that it forecasts the development of society scientifically, but also that it organises the people to struggle for the attainment of their scientifically based aim. Lenin pointed out that Marxism poses questions not only in the sense of explaining the past, but also in the sense of fearless prediction of the future and bold practical activity directed towards making it reality.

The class limitation of the bourgeois ideologists, their fear of looking into the future, results in the fact that many of them reject the possibility of predicting the future and deny the objective laws of social development.

There has been full justification of Lenin's words that "despair of ever being able to give a scientific analysis of the present, a denial of science, a tendency to despise all generalisations, to hide from all the 'laws' of historical development, and make the trees screen the *wood*—such is

the class idea underlying the fashionable bourgeois scepticism, the dead and deadening scholasticism",¹ which we also encounter today.

Practice has shown that capitalist ideologists' general statements about the future have been proved wrong time after time, whereas the scientific forecasting of Marxism-Leninism about the fate of mankind becomes concrete historical reality.

A person who lives in the capitalist world never knows what the next day will bring, whether he will have work and somewhere to live, whether his savings will be safe or whether he will be ruined, whether he will be able to survive at all in the rapid scientific and technological revolution.

This revolution is undoubtedly having an all-round influence on the development of society and the position of man in society. It is not only directly revolutionising material production, but is greatly affecting politics, ideology, international relations, military affairs, and morals, and is changing people's general view of the world. It is taking place in all the industrially developed countries, but its social consequences depend on the existing modes of social production.

Only the absence of private ownership of the instruments and means of production can create the necessary conditions for the achievements of science and technology to be used in the interests of the people, and not for the enrichment of a handful of monopolists.

The development of the scientific and technological revolution demands corresponding changes in social relations, improvements in the organisation and management of society, and confronts society with new problems.

Marxist-Leninist analysis of the modern stage of society's historical development shows that scientific and technological progress makes it possible for a man to feel increasingly confident and stable in relation to the world around him, which fact is confirmed by the experience of the socialist countries, although here, too, the scientific and technological revolution gives rise to its own difficulties and problems. One thing is certain: the more deeply people understand the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 199.

laws of objective reality, the more scientific and reliable their plans for the future become, and the more purposeful and effective their activity.

Proceeding from the cognised laws of social development and the need for revolutionary destruction of the capitalist order, Marx, Engels and Lenin, the ideologists of the working class, the most progressive class of modern society, were vitally interested in scientific forecasting of the future. For the working class and all working people there is not and cannot be any conflict between their ideal—communism—and future reality which corresponds to their basic interests.

Part II

BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT ABOUT THE FUTURE

Chapter 1

SOCIAL FORECASTING IN BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

The possibility, discovered by the founders of Marxism, of scientifically forecasting social development is of inestimable importance for the revolutionary activity of the working class, which has a vested interest in understanding the laws of the movement and development of society for the purpose of changing it. And it is by no means accidental that the opponents of Marxism have for a long time concentrated their efforts on "refuting" the thesis about the possibility of a scientific cognition of the laws of social development and consequently of forecasting future social development. In so doing they change from time to time the devices with which they attempt to refute the Marxist theory on the possibility of social forecasting.

In assessing the problem of historical forecasting, the neo-Kantians, for example, proceed from the general proposition that the general, the logical, i.e., the specific subject of science, is something subjective; in this way they reject the inner connection and possibility of cognising social phenomena, first and foremost, the laws of historical development.

Bourgeois historiography has been strongly influenced by the neo-Kantians W. Windelband and H. Rickert. Their works have been accepted by historians as the philosophical foundation of historiographical practice.

On the question of scientific forecasting, the neo-Kantians adopted a very definite position. They regarded the impossibility of such forecasting as an axiom. Rickert, for exam-

ple, used this "axiom" as an argument intended to prove his statement that the laws of the development of society simply do not exist. "...If laws of history existed," he wrote, "history would be able not only to explain the past, but also to forecast the future."¹

In principle the followers of Windelband and Rickert still make use of this sophism today. Thus, for example, Popper, Acton and others, basing their argument on the complexity of the historical process, deduce the methodological impossibility of scientific forecasting, and then proceeding from this impossibility conclude that the idea of determinism is "unfounded".

It is well known that Rickert, in contrasting nature with society, rejected any progressive development in nature and recognised in it only eternal repetition. In his view, development in history means only "the formation of the individual event".²

Marxists have expressed their opinions in detail on this question, and we shall confine ourselves here to remarking that this conception, which has long since been refuted by the achievements of the natural and social sciences, finds some advocates to this very day.³ The apogee of neo-Kantian philosophic enquiry was ultimately to "prove" that historiography which confines itself to describing events and rejects the existence of laws can also be called a science, and moreover, that it alone, as "the science of the individual event", is a true science, whereas generalising science departs from reality. The logic of this reasoning, directed against Marxism, may be reduced to the following: if history is an irrational process, devoid of all logic, and the decisive role in its development is played by the will of isolated individuals or chance, then the scientific forecasting of Marxists about the inevitable, natural victory of socialism is nothing but a fiction, a speculative doctrine of salvage, a prophecy, etc.

¹ H. Rickert, *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*, Tübingen und Leipzig, 1902, S. 525.

² H. Rickert, *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft*, Tübingen, 1910, S. 95.

³ W. Brünig, *Geschichtsphilosophie der Gegenwart*, Stuttgart, 1962, S. 95.

Therefore, when a "respectful attitude towards the uncognisability of the aim"¹ is advanced by Western historians as a compulsory element of historical thought, this can mean one thing only: the rejection of the possibility of forecasting, and consequently of the conscious transformation of the present.

The general crisis of capitalism has led some bourgeois ideologists to attempt to break out of the framework of the agnosticism and methodology of neo-Kantianism and create a world outlook (generalising in its content), which could serve as a "justification" for imperialism, for its existence in the face of its approaching collapse, and create the illusion of an historical perspective. As Anderle says, "at the present time voices are being heard with increasing persistence from all sides demanding the creation of large historical canvases reflecting whole epochs and periods ... and deep down our age, racked with crises and apocalyptic fears, is in constant view. An answer must be found to the questions which our age poses..."² However, the philosophy of history must not only give a recipe on how to overcome these fears of the collapse of the capitalist system, but at the same time accept the ideological challenge put to it by historical materialism and scientific communism. It is this which served "the awakening of the philosophy of history".³ Various philosophers of the present and recent past engaged in the study of history have tried, alongside theological and other speculative interpretations of history, to reach a rational understanding of the historical process, to create theoretical systems and use the latter as a basis for forecasting the historical processes of the future. We have in mind, first and foremost, the systems of Spengler and Toynbee, systems which, although they abound in speculative constructions, have as their aim the forecasting of the future. This book, writes Spengler in his work *The Decline of the West*, has made for the first time "the venture of predetermining history,

¹ *Das Fischer-Lexikon*, Bd. 24. *Geschichte*, Fr. a/M., 1965, 3. Aufl., S. 8, Einleitung.

² O. F. Anderle, "Besprechungen des Buches *Debates with Historians* by Pieter Geyl". Groningen und Den Haag, 1955, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1957, Bd. 183, S. 331.

³ F. Tönnis, "Troeltsch und die Philosophie der Geschichte", in *Soziologische Studien und Kritiken*, Zweite Sammlung, Jena, 1926, S. 382.

of following still untravelled stages in the destiny of a Culture, and specifically of the only Culture of our time and on our planet which is actually in the phase of fulfilment—the West-European-American”.¹

Basically what we are dealing with here are attempts to set up a personal approach to the problem of forecasting against Marxism. Unlike the neo-Kantians, the philosophers in question do not dispute the existence of the laws of the historical process and the possibility of predicting future social development on their basis. The neo-Kantian interpretation of history, although it envisages the possibility of the irrational “cognition of the meaning of history” and, moreover, prepares the ground for justifying such “cognition” by the irrationalisation of the historical process, does not recognise either purely speculative or historico-philosophical systems which claim to be scientific as having the right to prove the propositions which they advance with the help of historical facts. In other words, it disputes the possibility “of scientifically solving the question of being and its meaning”.² Toynbee, however, openly advocated the use of rational methods, particularly the comparative method, in historical science, and, therefore, renounced the neo-Kantian axiom of the individual event,³ which was incompatible with these methods. Spengler advocated “contemplation” and verbally rejected rational methods. As evidence of the speculative nature of Spengler’s ideas about the decline of Western Europe, his own statements are quoted, such as, for example: “...the phenomenon of the Great Cultures ... (must be) seen and felt and worked out...”⁴ However the birth of the organism is seen only by he who is able to lift the world cover of causality without giving thought to it.⁵ “Goethe ... hated Mathematics.... Sympathy, observation, comparison, immediate and inward certainty, intellectual *flair*—these were the means whereby he was

¹ Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, Vol. 1. *Form and Actuality*. Authorised translation with notes by Charles Francis Atkinson, New York, 1947, p. 3.

² F. Wagner, *Der Historiker und die Weltgeschichte*, München-Freiburg, 1965, S. 169.

³ A. J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*. Abridgement of volumes I-VI by D. C. Somervell, New York, London, 1965, p. 62.

⁴ Oswald Spengler, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 104.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 118-119.

enabled to approach the secrets of the phenomenal world in motion. *Now these are the means of historical research—precisely these and no other.*"¹ These statements are most characteristic and should be borne in mind in assessing Spengler's ideas. At the same time, however, one must remember that Spengler, like Toynbee after him, regarded his cultural cycles as isomorphic systems. Using the comparative method, Spengler ultimately reduces all cultural cycles to a single model and formulates laws of growth equally valid for all cultural cycles.

Spengler's basic error was not that he used this method, but that he applied it to phenomena which do not have the same structure. This, in turn, means that he proceeded from an incorrect central concept, namely, the cultural cycle. This error, incidentally, was repeated later by Toynbee. In the first place, one cannot explain the development of the cultural cycle by the existence of the "soul" of culture and outline the boundaries of the cycle by this "soul" (in the case of Toynbee, the soul is replaced by religion, style in art, a great discovery, etc.). In the second place, by rejecting continuous development one reduces development to an equivalent in form alternation of events, which, it is held, repeat themselves constantly in cultural cycles that replace one another or co-exist. The very idea of the cultural cycle was indisputably arbitrary, but the method used to study this construction was a rational one. That the idea of the cultural cycle is an arbitrary one is confirmed by the fact that Toynbee, as one of his West German critics has pointed out, gives the concept of "culture" a different meaning each time, which is basically inadmissible when using the general concept of "culture".² His definition of culture as "a single meaningful whole",³ as a construction limited in time and space, which must be studied to explain the history of a certain number of nations, peoples, etc., this definition, like Ranke's definition of the state, which he sees as something totally individual and representing, in his view, "a Divine design", is an abortive attempt. Toynbee's idea of the "meaning" of history as an attempt

¹ Oswald Spengler, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 25.

² F. Hampl, "Grundsätzliches zum Werk Arnold J. Toynbees", *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1952, Bd. 173, S. 449-66.

³ Arnold J. Toynbee, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 66.

"to ascend from the level of a primitive humanity to the height of some superhuman kind of living",¹ ("Society of saints"), is also arbitrary and not confirmed by the facts.

In spite of the attempts to use rational methods, in spite of the search for definite "laws", these systems are indubitably dogmatic, for their creators, as mentioned above, on the one hand, set up an initial system *a priori*, first and foremost, the so-called cultural cycles, and on the other hand, ignored facts which cannot be explained within the framework of their systems. And there were a fair number of such facts. Thus, for example, Spengler's system does not explain why Japan in the second half of the 19th century was able in forty years to reach the "Faustian cultural cycle" (for Spengler this cycle is equivalent to capitalist Western Europe). Nor did this theory justify itself in the case of such a phenomenon as the Soviet Union, which has no uniform physical conditions or a single race, the basic components of Spengler's "soul of culture", and which, nevertheless, was transformed over a short period into a united great power with a very distinctive culture. These and many other facts show that in treating the concept of culture Spengler was basing himself on arbitrary statements.

Toynbee's theory, in its turn, does not explain all the facts which bear witness to the unity of mankind's spiritual culture, and this is because he rejects the concept of a common material culture. This common material culture is seen, for example, in the unity of hieroglyphic writing of peoples at the early stages of civilisation. According to Toynbee, this is a paradoxical, inexplicable phenomenon, but from the point of view of the materialist interpretation of history it is completely logical. The creation of theoretical, albeit dogmatic systems took place, however, in the first instance not in order to explain historical facts, but to predetermine the future, as Spengler emphasises. And since all prediction in any science, from the point of view of logic, is always the deduction of facts on the basis of general laws, it is impossible to reject the creation of systems if one wishes to predict. There exists, however, an inseparable link between explaining and predicting, for theories which do not give a scientific explanation of events that have already taken place are of no use in predicting future

¹ Arnold J. Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

events. This connection emerged in the above-mentioned systems.

Thus, Spengler, and later Toynbee, were not able to create a correct system capable of explaining historical facts and, consequently, were unable to predict the future on the basis of their systems. This is seen most clearly in Spengler's gloomy predictions about Russia's industrial development. Thus, he stated, for example: "So also the Russian looks with fear and hatred at this tyranny of wheels, cables, and rails.... There will come a time when he will *blot out the whole thing from his memory and his environment*, and create about himself a wholly new world, in which nothing of this Devil's technique is left."¹ This prediction shows that Spengler totally misunderstood the essence of the historical process and its motive forces, and was, therefore, bound to make totally incorrect deductions.

This is also true of his predictions about the imminent "decline of the West". Here, it is true, the "decline", which was prophesied on the basis of the obvious external symptoms of the crisis of the capitalist system, was predicted correctly in a certain sense, for imperialism is indeed the highest and final stage, the stage of the collapse of capitalist society. However, the fall of capitalist society certainly does not mean the end of civilisation, the end of the progressive development of mankind, as Spengler and Toynbee believe. Consequently, this forecast is untenable in terms of historical prediction.

Basically the conclusion about the inevitable "decline of the West" is an analogy in which, proceeding from the formal resemblance of general sociological tendencies inherent in any antagonistic social formation at the final stage of its development, the period of its disintegration, the common fate of comparable social formations is inferred, namely, their decline. Inferences of this kind in respect of the objective, but at the same time formal repetition of certain symptoms are quite insufficient to explain the content of processes, that is, to explain their characteristic causes and the differences between them.²

¹ Oswald Spengler, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 504.

² For a detailed discussion, see *Historical Materialism and the Social Philosophy of the Modern Bourgeoisie*. Collected Articles, Moscow, 1960, p. 189 (in Russian).

In this case Spengler differs from Toynbee in that he is consistent and follows the determinist principle to the end, whereas Toynbee refrains from predicting the fate of the West. "Our *post mortem* examination of dead civilisations does not enable us to cast the horoscope of our own civilisation or of any other that is still alive,"¹ he writes. He refuses for perfectly understandable reasons to draw any final conclusions about the decline of culture on the basis of his theory, accuses Spengler of "dogmatic determinism" and in contradiction with the whole of his system wants to give the West the chance of eternal existence.

It was, of course, impossible to conceal this contradiction from such bourgeois critics as F. Hampl, for example, the neo-Kantian historian. He writes: "After this you wait for Toynbee, like Spengler ... to recognise the existence of a strict logic in history and to recognise also that each culture is doomed by the highest law to perish at some time or other in a definite way. How else could one understand the uniformity of the process of decline of all cultures which have perished before us? Toynbee, however, ... far from drawing consistent conclusions from his theory of the decline of cultures, like Spengler, offers our West European culture which, in his opinion, is the only flourishing culture at the present time, considerable chances of so-called eternal existence. All other cultures, in his opinion, declined only through the fault of people, consequently, West European culture will continue to exist if we are sensible and fulfil the various demands advanced by Toynbee... ."²

Since for reasons of a class nature bourgeois ideologists refuse to make a concrete analysis of the social processes they examine, their views on the possibility of overcoming this "crisis of existence" are bound inevitably to be utopian, fantastic and unreal. To create the "world state", about which Toynbee dreams, national states will not subject themselves voluntarily to the dictate of American monopolies and allow the latter to enslave them; nor can the class struggle in the world be destroyed with the help of any manipulations, such as changes in the conditions of distribution, or the "turning" of the "majority", i.e., the working people, to a definite faith, etc. Personal loyalty to bourgeois society

¹ Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilisation on Trial*, New York, 1948, p. 12.

² *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1952, Bd. 173, S. 465.

does not allow him to recognise the irreconcilability of the above-mentioned convictions. As a result, he makes the fate of Western Europe depend on the grace of God: "The divine spark of creative power is still alive in us, and, if we have the grace to kindle it into flame, then the stars in their courses cannot defeat our efforts to attain the goal of human endeavour".¹

Here "prediction" turns into open prophecy. Fritz Wagner, a West German critic of neo-Kantian contemplation, hits the nail on the head when he detects in Toynbee's works "vacillation between a positivist position and prophetic hope".² In spite of the fact that Toynbee constantly insists that he is far from any "dogmatic determinism" and prefers voluntarism to determinism in his conclusions, many bourgeois historians, as we have seen in the cases of Hampl and Wagner, have not allowed themselves to be deceived and have recognised the true nature of his system.

It is interesting, however, that the main criticism levelled at Toynbee, and also at other historians of the same trend, is not that he makes excessive concessions to the principle of determinism, concessions which are not compatible with neo-Kantian views, but that he interprets the fate of Western Europe pessimistically and by his "fantastic false doctrines undermines the foundations and threatens the future of West European culture".³

Exactly the same criticism was made of Spengler and Toynbee by Karl Popper, the well-known opponent of scientific historical prediction, and it is characteristic that he criticised them not only for trying to predict history, but first and foremost for the pessimistic nature of their prediction. "If enough people believe in the decline of the West," he writes, "the West will certainly decline, even if it would have continued its ascent without this propaganda."⁴

It is quite clear that pragmatic views rejected most decisively as contradicting "objectivity" by the supporters

¹ Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, p. 297.

² F. Wagner, *Der Historiker und die Weltgeschichte*, S. 148.

³ G. Ritter, "Besprechung des Buches *Die Diskussion ohne Ende*, von Pieter Geyl", Darmstadt, 1958, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1959, Bd. 188, S. 86.

⁴ Karl R. Popper, "Selbstbefreiung durch das Wissen", *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, München, 1961, S. 108.

of the neo-Kantian interpretation of history in discussions on philosophico-methodological problems, play a certain role at least in the given case where the possibility or impossibility of scientific prediction is involved.

Popper's criticism does contain a rational kernel, it is true, for between scientific prediction and that which is predicted there is a feedback namely, that people can regulate their actions one way or the other on the basis of prediction. Even under state-monopoly capitalism it is quite possible, by taking into account scientific forecasts of economic development, to try to avert to some extent a certain imbalance in the economy or, on the basis of statistical calculations, to avoid a predicted over-production of certain goods. However, on no account must one make this possibility absolute and go on to eliminate the laws of historical development, as Popper does.

We do not dispute the fact that predicting the future "decline of the West" may have a demoralising effect on its defenders and accelerate this decline. But just as the speculative prediction of a state of society in the future cannot of itself produce this state if the conditions for it have not yet matured (suffice it to mention, for example, Kant's views on the eternal world or the ideal organisation of society), so predicting a decline cannot of itself bring about this decline if the social formation in question is in the stage of ascent. The imminent collapse of the Soviet Union, as we know, was constantly being predicted by its enemies, but this forecast could not prevent the Soviet Union's rapid development.

As far as the aim of forecasts made by such philosophers as Spengler and Toynbee is concerned, it is the exact opposite of what Popper regards as the effect of this forecast.

To return to the analysis of Toynbee's theory, one must point out its purely speculative religious idea about the Divine requirement for the embodiment of the meaning of history with the help of the people's concrete actions. In discussing this theory, critics have expressed certain doubts as to the mass effect of a purely religious doctrine. "To trace that which providence has prepared for us..." writes W. den Boer, "is an absurd thing for both believers and unbelievers, for the latter because they do not believe in providence, and for the former because they regard the final decision as to

ascent or decline, crime and punishment, cause and effect, as being outside historical knowledge and await this decision, having totally submitted to it in advance."¹

The emphasis on non-religious theories of the industrial society promoted this awareness of deficiency mentioned by W. den Boer. How low bourgeois ideologists rate the chances of elevating any doctrine based on religion to the rank of a single ideology for the West may be seen from the following statement by the Dutch historian P. Geyl. "As for me, I think that the prospects of a universal turning to some faith or other, on which Toynbee is relying, are so slight that if we were to advance such a doctrine it would be the death sentence for the future of our culture."²

Realising the untenability of the views on the future advanced by Spengler and Toynbee, bourgeois philosophers and sociologists have sought for a positive solution to the problem. They advance all manner of solutions—from outright recognition of the impossibility of delving into the future to attempts to solve the question from the viewpoint of abstract anthropology (this is characteristic mainly of philosophical trends). Others, primarily bourgeois sociologists, incline to develop a "truly scientific" outlook of social development, usually seeing "technological determinism" and various versions of the ideology of industrialism as the sheet anchor. Let us now consider the most well-known philosophical and sociological theories about the future in the capitalist countries of the West.

Chapter 2

NEO-POSITIVIST SCEPTICISM VERSUS MARXIST HISTORISM

Neo-positivism, like the positivist doctrine of Mach and Avenarius which preceded it, was formed in the polemic with the neo-Kantians and with the *a priori* interpretation of scientific methodology. However, like neo-Kantianism (particularly that of the Baden school), neo-positivism ar-

¹ W. den Boer, *Toynbee and Classical History: Historiography and Myth*. Quoted from O. F. Anderle, *Die Toynbee Kritik. Das universal-historische System Arnold J. Toynbees im Urteil der Wissenschaft*, Saeculum, 1958, Bd. 9, S. 227.

² P. Geyl, *Die Diskussion ohne Ende*, Darmstadt, 1958, S. 128.

rived at a rejection of the science of society which studies the laws of its functioning and development and, consequently, a rejection of the possibility of objective scientific forecasting.

Windelband and Rickert stated that history deals with single, unique, individual events, as a result of which historical study can only individualise and not generalise, i.e., not sum up the socio-historical process. Neo-positivism also reached the same conclusion when it embarked on a positivistic treatment of sociology.

It is common knowledge that the watchword "back to Kant" proclaimed by bourgeois philosophers in the second half of the 19th century was directed primarily against the materialist interpretation of history, Marxist historicism. Even if this was not obvious at the very beginning, it became quite clear in the works of the father of revisionism, Eduard Bernstein, who produced a neo-Kantian revision of Marxism. One of Bernstein's main theoretical lines was the thesis that all the historical predictions contained in the teaching of Marx and Engels should be regarded as "unscientific" additions to the purely empirical description of observed social facts. This line was used by Bernstein to deny the possibility of applying Marxian theory to the bourgeois society of the late 19th and early 20th century.

The neo-Kantians tried to challenge the Marxist doctrine of the laws of social development with the idea that the concept of a law was applicable only in the natural sciences and not in human history. Proceeding from this thesis, Rickert asserted that historical events can only be assessed on an *a priori* scale of values which are capable of stimulating (but not determining) the activity of people in a certain way, including their participation in the historical process. From this viewpoint events cannot be regarded as objectively determined and people's activity is not determined by anything, but at the same time it is directed by 'conscious,' accepted transcendental values in accordance with their wishes and choice.

Rickert declared that "philosophy will always have to fight against *historism* as a world outlook".¹ The true meaning

¹ *Die Philosophie im Beginn des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Festschrift für Kuno Fischer*, Heidelberg, 1907, S. 329.

of this neo-Kantian thesis was, firstly, that it rejected historical determinism and, secondly, that it rejected the possibility of scientifically forecasting social phenomena. Rickert stated that it is not possible to predict even the immediate future with any certainty. That which will depend partially on the decisions of isolated individuals or can at least be decisively influenced by them. And individual action cannot be predicted.

It is perfectly clear that rejection of historical determinism and rejection of the possibility of scientific prediction in history are two sides of the same coin. And it is equally clear that both theses are aimed against Marxism. Moreover, modern neo-positivism has made this challenge more profound by asserting basically, unlike neo-Kantianism, that any theoretical evaluation of historical facts is beyond the bounds of scientific authenticity because it is in principle incapable of being verified and logically proved.

The hostility of neo-positivism towards the science of society, historicism, is masked by demands for "strict", "genuine" science (in this respect neo-positivist criticism of historicism differs from irrationalist criticism, particularly existentialist) and culminates logically in pseudo-scientific neo-positivist substantiation. It is for this very reason that a critical analysis of the neo-positivist version of anti-historicism seems to us to be particularly topical.

Among the modern neo-positivists the most famous for his works on sociology is Karl Popper. He first acquired fame in the sphere of the methodology of the natural sciences. Like other neo-positivists, he tried to argue the possibility of verifying empirical propositions by reducing them to elementary "basic propositions", incapable of being broken down any further, which, he maintained, simply recorded facts, without interpreting them in any way. The subjective-idealist conception of verification does not recognise objective reality, the comparison with which provides the only method of testing any statements. As is well known, this conception was rejected later by the positivists themselves. In this connection Popper attempted to replace the principle of verification of empirical propositions by the principle of "falsification". He tried to apply these neo-positivist principles to social science. In the sphere of social science Popper's aim is to attack historicism, the most important

elements of which he regards, not without good cause, as being historical determinism and acknowledgement of the possibility of historical prediction.

Anti-historism and nihilist rejection of the science of society

Ever since the emergence of Marxism bourgeois ideology has been waging a fierce battle against historism. This battle takes on all manner of forms depending on the circumstances. In some cases it is an outright rejection of the objective need for development both in nature and in society, the rejection of historical determinism. In other cases attempts to refute the historical approach to nature and society take the form of historical relativism, which, although it recognises the emergence of the new, rejects the existence of social progress. In all cases, the struggle of modern bourgeois ideologists against historism means rejection of the possibility of historical prediction.

Marxist historism is not limited to explaining the present, given, existing stage of development with the help of the past. Marxist historism, by basing itself on a study of the past and the present, and tracing trends of development and the objective laws which determine them, boldly predicts the future.

Neo-positivism is a highly refined rejection of historism. This is why Karl Popper begins his attack on historism by declaring that he is a convinced supporter of historism and equally convinced opponent of historicism. "Historism," he writes, "must not, of course, be mixed up with historicism."¹

In his book *The Poverty of Historicism*, Popper states that the scientific method (meaning the application of neo-positivism to sociology) would be "anti-historicist, but by no means anti-historical. Historical experience would serve it as a most important source of information...."² Further on he explains that unlike historicism historism does not claim to discover the "laws of social development" but confines itself to simply describing that which has been.

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, London, 1957, p. 208.

² Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, Boston, 1957, p. 46.

Thus, Popper recognises historism only to the extent to which it is not the theoretical generalisation and study of the laws of the development of society.

Lenin pointed out that in the 20th century, and at the end of the 19th, everyone agreed with the "principle of development". However, as Lenin emphasised, this "agreement" frequently stifles and debases the truth. The same can be said about Popper's "agreement" with the "principle of historism". This agreement which is masked by the verbal distinction between historism and historicism, means in fact, as Popper himself announces, that "the observational basis of sociology can be given only in the form of a chronicle of events, namely of political or social happenings".¹ So this, in Popper's view, is the scientific interpretation of historism, whereas "sociology, to the historicist, is theoretical history".²

Consequently, Popper admits the possibility only of empirical sociology, rejecting theoretical sociology. This concept was generally accepted in bourgeois sociology at the time when Popper wrote *The Poverty of Historicism* (1946).

Bourgeois sociologists today criticise any attempt to reduce sociological study to the empirical description of social facts and are seeking to create theoretical conceptions. But Popper continues to state categorically that history and theory are incompatible. This means that the historical process cannot be the object of theoretical research or, in other words, the logical and the historical are mutually exclusive as a matter of principle. Thus, Popper's distinction between historism and historicism is by no means a valid recognition of historism. That which Popper sets up against "historicism" and calls historism can be reduced to the simple statement that the history of society exists and the study of it is useful.

But historism cannot be reduced to this banal truth. In spite of Popper's assurances, his anti-historicism is actually anti-historism. This becomes even more obvious if we point out that according to Popper the concept of development has an extremely limited meaning even in biology. The development of life on earth, says Popper, is an individual

¹ Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, p. 38.

² *Ibid.*, p. 41.

phenomenon which does not give grounds for assuming evolution to be universal. And even less grounds, he maintains, for talking about "social evolution". The concept of movement is, strictly speaking, inapplicable to society: "...We ought to be clear that we are simply using a metaphor, and a rather misleading one at that. For if we speak in physics of the movement of a body or a system of bodies, then we do not intend to imply that the body or system in question undergoes any internal or structural change, but only that it changes its position relative to some (arbitrarily chosen) system of co-ordinates. As opposed to this, the sociologist means by a 'movement of society' some structural or internal change."¹ Although Popper is a well-known specialist in the field of neo-positivist "philosophy of science", one cannot help remarking that he gives an extremely narrow, purely mechanistic interpretation to movement, seeing it only as a change in position. He excludes "internal or structural change" from this concept of movement. Such a limited interpretation of movement is obviously the result of his attempt to prove that this concept is inapplicable to society. "...The idea that society, like a physical body, can *move as a whole* along a certain path and in a certain direction—is merely a holistic confusion," he writes.² Popper attempts to supplement the neo-Kantian rejection of the applicability of general scientific categories to sociology by using simplified interpretations of the concepts of movement and development. However, his main argument against historicism coincides with the neo-Kantian posing of the question. Without naming his predecessors, Popper states categorically: "I wish to defend the view, so often attacked as old-fashioned by historicists, that history is characterised by its interest in actual, singular, or specific events, rather than in laws or generalisations."³

Also like the neo-Kantians, Popper regards scientific interest in the singular and specific as incompatible with theoretical generalisation which reveals the general, recurring oneness in the mass of different phenomena. For this reason he calls the natural sciences "generalising sciences"

¹ Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, p. 113.

² *Ibid.*, p. 114.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

which study the laws of movement, but states that the subject of historical science is the "specific, particular event" from which, in his view, it follows that "there can be no historical laws".¹

There is no need for us to go into any more detail about Popper's attitude to the neo-Kantian conception of history and natural science. It is far more important to point out what distinguishes him from these representatives of bourgeois liberalism at the end of the last century. The neo-Kantians confined themselves to the thesis that theoretical generalisation is impossible in the study of history. Popper goes much further than this epistemological criticism of historism, for his aim is not only to prove that theoretical study of the socio-historical process is impossible, but to substantiate the theory that such study is fundamentally hostile to science and presents a serious threat to the very existence of civilisation. Thus, from his point of view, the epistemological criticism of historism is supplemented by socio-political "denunciation".

Popper regards as the essence of "historicism" recognition of the possibility of long-term social prediction, which, in his opinion, is fundamentally impossible and has never been done. This is why he maintains that "historicism" is an "oracular philosophy" and that the supporters of "historicism" are "false prophets". He defines "historicism" as "an approach to the social sciences which assumes that *historical prediction* is their principal aim, and which assumes that this aim is attainable by discovering the 'rhythms' or the 'patterns', the 'laws' or the 'trends' that underlie the evolution of history".²

Popper is well aware that recognising the possibility of historical prediction is indissolubly bound up with recognising the laws of the socio-historical process, and, therefore, refutes both unconditionally. He does not conceal the motives for his irreconcilable hostility to historical determinism. The whole point is, he says, that "the tenets of historicism ... are topical today because they form a very important part of that philosophy which likes to call itself by the name of 'scientific Socialism' or 'Marxism'".³

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, p. 264.

² Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, p. 3.

³ Karl R. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations*, London, 1963, p. 336.

Thus, Popper's campaign against "historicism" is, first and foremost, a campaign against Marxism. It is this which determines the whole tenor of his criticism, all his persistent efforts to show the absurdity of the "claims" of historicism. In his opinion, the very nature of knowledge precludes the possibility of predicting the future. It is impossible, he added, to anticipate today that which one shall know only tomorrow. In other words, it is impossible to gain the knowledge which people lack. Therefore, it is impossible to predict the future course of man's history. The main purpose of the historicist method is thus unjustified and historicism is deprived of its foundation.

Popper assumes that the propositions formulated by him are axioms and does not consider it necessary to substantiate them in any detail. But prediction of the future by no means implies knowledge of that which we do not know. This is equally applicable to the natural sciences and the social sciences. If an astronomer forecasts an eclipse of the sun on the basis of the data which he possesses, an economist acts fundamentally in the same way when he forecasts a change in the economic cycle, a crisis of over-production, etc. Of course, the prediction of new phenomena which have not yet taken place is more complex than prediction of recurrent phenomena, as is usually the case in astronomy. But this prediction of the new is also based on the analysis of facts describing the past and present. Thus, Lenin brilliantly predicted the inevitability of the victory of socialism first in one country on the basis of the law, discovered by him, of the unequal economic and political development of capitalism.

Popper totally excludes the possibility of scientific prediction in sociology and attacks any attempt at historical prediction as an attempt to "close" the future, to make inevitable that which should be the result of free will. This form of framing the question proceeds from a metaphysical distinction between the logical and the historical, the absolute gulf between them. He makes no mention in his work of a single scientific prediction in the social sciences, as if there had never been any. Yet objective social analysis demands an examination of such predictions, not an outright rejection of the facts. Instead of examining the facts and theories of scientific prediction, Popper discusses

the untenability of claims to "all-embracing" prediction of the future, although he should be aware that Marxism rejects the possibility not only of all-embracing prediction, but of all-embracing absolute knowledge about the present.

Popper does not analyse the propositions of the classics of Marxism about the possibilities and limits of scientific prediction in sociology. If he had done so, it would have become obvious that it was the classics of Marxism who subjected to profound criticism the very "oracular pretensions" which Popper ascribes to Marxism.

Recognition of objective laws and the inevitable link between social events is regarded by Popper as an auxiliary device by means of which "historicism" justifies its false claim to be able to predict the future. According to Popper, the inevitable connection of phenomena and, consequently, the possibility of predicting them exist only in the natural sciences.

Like all neo-positivists, he advocates the application of the methods of natural science in sociology, on the one hand, and, on the other, rejects the possibility of applying to society such recognised categories in natural science as law, inevitability and causality. The inconsistency of this methodological dualism is revealed in the fact that Popper does not reject recurrence in history and admits the existence in history of certain "regularities". For example, technical progress, population growth, etc., have existed throughout human history. However, these facts, in Popper's opinion, do not bear witness to the existence of social laws. Popper makes an absolute distinction between social laws and trends which, in his opinion, can be seen in human history. He maintains that "laws and trends are radically different things".¹ What exactly is the difference? "A statement asserting the existence of a trend is existential, not universal," Popper declares. "A universal law, on the other hand, does not assert existence ... it asserts the impossibility of something or other."²

The meaning of the statements quoted would appear to be that a trend is simply a fact about which one can only say that it exists. With regard to a law, according to Popper,

¹ Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, pp. 115-116.

² *Ibid.*, p. 115.

it asserts impossibility (i.e., the absence of existence) of a certain phenomenon, for example, perpetuum mobile.

It is easy to demonstrate that this interpretation of trends and laws holds no water. If a trend is universal (and Popper does acknowledge the existence of such trends), then its very universality bears witness to its inevitability and hence its conformity with a law. Universality is inseparable from necessity and a law is the necessary, essential form of universality. To regard a law simply as a prohibition, an exclusion of a certain type of phenomena (those which contradict the law), means ignoring the main thing in any law: the necessary connection between existent phenomena. Hence, a law is just as "existential" as is a trend.

Naturally, not every trend is a law. But if a trend is constantly in force and necessary, if it determines the process within the framework of which it acts, then it is a law. It was in this sense that Marx described the economic laws of capitalism as tendencies. Marxism put an end to the absolutisation of trends and laws by showing that they are historically determined. The defect which Popper ascribes to historicism has in fact been rectified by Marxist historicism. It was Marxism that showed laws that are connected with definite, historically changing conditions. It also proved the inconsistency of attempts to apply the laws of nature to the life of society and revealed the qualitative difference between social laws and natural laws which act without the participation of people. Popper, however, accuses sociology, and the materialist interpretation of history in particular, of trying to interpret the laws of social development like the laws of nature. And proceeding from this premise he declares that "the hope, more especially, that we may some day find the 'laws of motion of society', just as Newton found the laws of motion of physical bodies, is nothing but the result of these misunderstandings".¹ Here it is Popper who is guilty of "misunderstandings", for he himself fails to grasp the variety of laws operating in objective reality.

The law is the essence of a phenomenon, the connection between essences, the necessary, relatively constant, recurring relationship determining the motion, the change of the given class of phenomena. This scientific, dialectically mate-

¹ Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, p. 115.

rialist interpretation of the nature of the law is naturally incompatible with Popper's subjectivist, neo-positivist conception.

In calling the recognition of regularity of necessity in the life of society naturalism, Popper is clearly falsifying the concept of naturalism in sociology. Sociological naturalism, as the whole history of sociology shows, means the application of the laws of nature to the life of society, the identification of natural and social laws. This methodological premise is characteristic of anti-historical conceptions, in particular of positivist "organic sociology" which examines society by analogy with a biological organism.

Popper rejects this approach, not because of its inconsistent identification of the social with the biological, but because "organicism" admits the objective conditionality of the phenomena of social life, the objective necessary connection of social phenomena. Recognising only subjectively (conventionally) interpreted necessity, laws, etc., Popper attacks historicism because it regards social laws as existent and operating outside and independently of human consciousness. He opposes historicism as a subjective idealist who rejects both the materialist and the objectively idealist recognition of reality independent of human consciousness and will.

Not confining himself to epistemological arguments which have been disproved long ago by dialectical and historical materialism, Popper proceeds to a moral criticism of the theoretical conception which he ascribes to historicism. Historicism, he maintains, is an attempt to tie the hands of succeeding generations and force them to follow the prophet who tells them that he knows their future. Scientific prophecy, writes Popper, "provides an escape from our present responsibilities into a future paradise".¹ In fact, he continues, sweeping historical predictions bear witness only to the irresponsibility of those who make them or, which is even worse, to their attempts to reinforce their plans for political changes by referring to the necessity of that for which they are fighting. It is common knowledge that Marxist-Leninist recognition of the possibility of scientific prediction takes into account both its objective possibilities and its historical limitations. The classics of Marxism frequently subjected to the most

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, p. 139.

scathing criticism all possible sorts of false prophecy, from religious to pseudo-scientific and utopian, while continuing to emphasise the possibility of scientific study of the trends in social evolution and their future results. Marxism proved this possibility not only in theory, but also in practice during the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist construction.

Popper, who is sufficiently aware of these facts, attempts to get round them with the following argument. The Marxists, he says, achieved certain aims in the 20th century which they had set themselves in the 19th century. But this does not support the contention that scientific prediction is possible, nor, Popper assures us, does it prove the correctness of Marx's and Engels' predictions about the inevitability of the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. If the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc., had appeared without human intervention, in the same way as a lunar eclipse, then, he announces, one could admit the possibility of scientifically predicting the future of society. Since historical events are the result of human activity they cannot be the object of prediction. We can predict a typhoon and take safety measures against it, says Popper, but here it is a question of predicting an event which we cannot prevent from taking place. Popper calls this prediction a "technical" or "technological" one. It is a different matter with historical prediction, the object of which are events that can be prevented from occurring. Thus, according to Popper, the very nature of the social process makes long-term social prediction impossible.

In other words, Popper is maintaining that people create their own history and consequently there is not and cannot be any historical (or objective) necessity determining their actions and the results of those actions.

Sociological determinism, in his view, cultivates fatalistic inactivity, passivity, irresponsibility, and prevents people from setting themselves goals and attaining them. The neo-positivist clearly does not differentiate between fatalism and the recognition of the objective conditionality of human actions. He admits only that people create the circumstances of their own lives, and closes his eyes to the fact that it is circumstances (first and foremost, those created by people themselves) which determine their behaviour. Popper has

clearly become confused by two equally false metaphysical conceptions—fatalism and voluntarism. Under the flag of rejecting teleology he denies that the aims which individuals and social groups set themselves reflect something objectively existing. Such an "attack" on teleology is obviously demagogic.

Since the central point of Popper's indeterministic conception is the statement that the recognition of historical necessity is a vestige of primitive ideas about fate, it should be stressed that the real origin of the category "necessity" dates back to ancient Greek materialism and its struggle with mythological ideas of superhuman predestination. In this connection it should suffice to mention Democritus and his followers, particularly Epicurus.

Popper's statement about the mythological source of the concept of historical necessity is obviously biased for the additional reason that he acknowledges the category of necessity in the natural sciences. The history of sociology shows without a doubt that the concept of historical necessity emerged in connection with the determinist interpretation of natural phenomena. One finds materialists trying to apply the determinism of the natural sciences to social life as far back as the 17th and 18th centuries.

Popper pays special attention to the analysis of naturalism in sociology. However, absurd as it is, he attempts to depict naturalism as the "naturalistic" interpretation of the mythological idea of fate. This type of "naturalism" is found, of course, in the idealists who attempt to reconcile determinism with the acceptance of Divine predetermination. But it is common knowledge that in the history of philosophy determinism was argued and supported mainly by the materialists who worked out a naturalist interpretation of social life in their struggle with the teleological conception of human history.

Thus, Popper distorts the genesis of the concept of historical necessity in order to attack historical materialism and the doctrine of the inevitability of communism. In order to refute this doctrine he regards historical materialism as a teleological interpretation of history. Marx and Engels constantly pointed out that history has no previously conceived goal or plan and that the tasks which confront society at each stage of its development are presented by definite classes in ac-

cordance with the material conditions and possibilities at their disposal. These conditions and possibilities are created by preceding generations, and each new generation is forced to accept them as a point of departure for its own activity. It is because of this, as Lenin points out, that "our subjective preferences do not determine the changes in historical periods".¹ Thus, objective conditionality and conscious human action mutually complement each other and form the two, dialectically united aspects of the single socio-historical process. Popper is acting like the true metaphysicist who does not want to understand the vital dialectic of history. For him there is only one alternative: either historical necessity or conscious action by people creating definite social forms. In fact, such an alternative does not exist in the real historical process. It exists only in the ideas of metaphysicists and these ideas were disproved long ago by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

It should also be noted that Popper tries to attack historicism (and the related concepts of historical necessity and the laws of social evolution) from yet another angle which is of some interest. Noting correctly that recognition of the laws of development, of objective historical necessity presupposes differentiation between the external and the internal, the non-essential and the essential, phenomenon and essence, Popper says that this type of differentiation is wrong and is a vestige of essentialism, long since discredited.

For Popper recognition of the objective basis, the essence, the law as something distinct from sense data is essentialism, i.e., an obviously false doctrine. His polemic against essentialism turns out to be a subjective idealist rejection of materialism and objective idealism. This conception is known in the history of philosophy as phenomenism: its champions (David Hume, the positivists and neo-positivists) usually claim that apart from phenomena nothing else (essence) exists, that "essence" is an artificial concept leading to mysticism, scholasticism and meaningless discussion. From the viewpoint of the phenomenologists the striving to understand the essence of phenomena is no different from scholastic philosophising which states that opium is soporific because it possesses soporific properties.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 253.

Karl Popper calls his phenomenological position "methodological nominalism". The adjective "methodological" shows that he does not intend to discuss the question of the reality of the universal in nature or society. But this does not prevent him from holding that the "rational method" acknowledges the existence of singular objects only and denies all forms of universality in the reality being studied. Then what about mathematics and logic, whose objects of study are definite forms of universality? To this question Popper, like all modern positivists, replies with a subjective denial of any experimental content in these sciences. Thus, he maintains that "pure mathematics and logic, which permit of proofs, give us no information about the world, but only develop the means of describing it".¹

This rejection of the objectivity of the universal and, consequently, also the rejection of the objective content of the categories of essence, and regularity enable the neo-positivist to reject the principle of historicism, which is interpreted by him as essentialistic prejudice. From this point of view, the science of society inevitably appears essentialistic as soon as it makes claim to theoretical analysis and scientific prediction. But what about natural science which generalises, reveals laws and makes predictions? Popper tells us that all these features of the natural sciences and their related accomplishments are ensured methodologically by a fundamental rejection of... essentialism. In Popper's opinion, the natural sciences have no interest whatsoever in the essence of phenomena. They do not answer the question "why?", only the question "how?". Their methodological premises are purely nominalistic. "Physics," states Popper, "does not inquire, for instance, into the essence of atoms or of light, but it uses these terms with great freedom to explain and describe certain physical observations."² Popper's campaign against historicism leads not only to phenomenology, but also to a rejection of the scientific requirement that a concept should be defined, a rejection of concepts themselves as consciously applied forms of generalisation, and to the substitution of conventional signs and labels for concepts.

Thus Popper arrives at the rejection of the basic categories of social science, at the nihilistic rejection of the possibil-

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, p. 13.

² Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, p. 29.

ity of sociology as a theoretical discipline and in the final analysis at a subjectivist interpretation of the process of cognition and a rejection of the concept of objective truth. Such is the objective logic of the struggle against historicism, the logic of the degradation of bourgeois philosophico-sociological thought.

Anti-historism and the problem of the communist
transformation of society

Popper's criticism of "historicism" as a methodology which allegedly arose in ancient times is merely an introduction to his critique of Marxist historicism. Marxism, he claims, is "the purest form of historicism" and leads to the gravest errors and the most serious practical consequences. And "Marx is responsible for the devastating influence of the historicist method of thought".¹

In order to understand the strange logic behind these accusations, it is necessary to consider, albeit briefly, the philosophico-historical conception set out in his two-volume work *The Open Society and Its Enemies*.

According to Popper, civilisation arises in the struggle with collectivism, the initial historical form of which is tribalism. In its subsequent historical development civilisation continues to struggle against new historical forms of collectivism, such as racism, nationalism, fascism and ... socialism.

Popper regards the individual and the collective as being absolute opposites and proceeds from this to deduce that collectivism is incompatible with democracy and is essentially... totalitarianism. Thus, by emasculating the real historical content of totalitarianism as the special form of the dictatorship of monopoly capital and metaphysically contrasting collectivism and freedom as absolute opposites. Popper condemns socialism and its ideology. With the aim of substantiating the anti-communist thesis which equates collectivism, fascism and communism, Popper tries to prove that all the historical forms of totalitarianism or collectivism listed by him are based on "historicism". Whereas the basis of primitive tribalism was spontaneously formed by mythological ideas, taboos, prejudice, customs and rites, the basis of the "new tribalism", or totalitarianism, is formed, accord-

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, pp. 81-82.

ing to Popper, by definite, consciously developed philosophical and sociological doctrines. These doctrines, from Heraclitus and Plato up to and including Hegel and Marx, for all their differences, have the same methodological essence which Popper calls "historicism". Thus, the main point in Popper's critique of "historicism" is its, as it were, moral and political criticism.

From this it is clear why Popper calls "historicism" "the most powerful of these philosophies",¹ and why he adds that "historicism is futile and worse than that",² trying to persuade the reader that historicism by its very nature is hostile to reason and freedom, and is, therefore, the eternal enemy of civilisation. In order to lend his criticism of Marxist historicism the appearance of scientific objectivity, Popper begins by admitting: "One cannot do justice to Marx without recognising his sincerity.... His sincerity in his search for truth and his intellectual honesty distinguish him, I believe, from many of his followers".³ However, this sincerity and intellectual honesty do not change the real content of his teaching, for Marx was an "historicist" and consequently, in spite of all his merits, "a false prophet".⁴

Popper poses the question of whether there is a difference between Marx's historical method and preceding historicism. And he attempts to answer it without analysing dialectical materialism and the materialist interpretation of history. Ignoring the qualitative difference between Marxism and the preceding doctrines, Popper concludes that Marx's "historicism" was merely more consistent, "pure" and "radical" than all preceding forms of "historicism".

Historicism is the fundamental, essential feature of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. The substance of this scientific principle may be briefly summarised as follows: 1) recognition of the universality and importance of change and development, the study of the objective necessity, laws and specific forms of this process; 2) recognition of the necessary connection not only between phenomena and events co-existing or existing simultaneously (or in a short space of time), but also between the past and the present, the present and the

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 1, p. 2.

² Ibid., p. 34.

³ Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 32.

⁴ Ibid.

future; 3) the concrete, historical examination of phenomena and events from the viewpoint of the historically transient conditions which have determined them and given them the specific form of the given historical period; 4) recognition of the possibility of scientifically forecasting events in the immediate or more or less distant future on the basis of studying the laws determining their recurrence or re-emergence.

The scientific principle of historism, which is the application of dialectical materialism to the study of the process of development, has played a vast role in the development of both natural and social sciences. Creating scientific communism, theoretically substantiating the necessity of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and communism, and proving the historically transient character of private ownership, the class structure of society, social inequality, and the state—all this was possible thanks to the concrete, historical study of human history, the discovery of specific, qualitatively different epochs in world history (socio-economic formations), the study of their historical necessity and the objective law of transition from one formation to the next.

Marxist historism is the scientific interpretation of history in which we distinguish the past, present and future. The study of the past, the reconstruction of the true picture of past events, their concrete historical assessment, are, without a doubt, among the most important tasks of the historical science. An even more important task for the materialist interpretation of history is the scientific analysis of the present in relation to the past and in its motion revealing the trends of future development. The main point in the Marxist historical method is the demand "not to forget the underlying historical connection, to examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what were the principal stages in its development, and, from the standpoint of its development, to examine what it has become today".¹

From the Marxist point of view, predicting the future is possible only if it is based on analysing trends existing and developing in the present. Marx and Engels always criticised the utopians for their attempts to anticipate everything,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 473.

to give a detailed description of future society, etc. They emphasised that scientific prediction of the future is limited by the factual data the researcher has at his disposal. These basic features of Marxist historism, of the Marxist theory of development, were also classically defined by Lenin in his works.

For a long time bourgeois critics of Marxism and Marxist historism have been attempting to prove that this scientific theory is nothing but a sort of prophecy and thus to accuse it of being unscientific. Popper follows this well-trodden path. Marxist historism, he says, is more radical than all preceding "historicist" theories, because it believes that people's consciousness, their conscious activity, is determined by material conditions independent of their consciousness and will.

In Marxist theory, Popper maintains, the individual is entirely determined by "society", "economics", "progress" and other, to his mind, essentialist concepts. The basis of this fatalistic conception ascribed to Marx is rooted, according to Popper, in tribalism. He states outright that the main proposition of the materialist interpretation of history "holds most emphatically for the more ancient periods of social development, i.e. for the closed society.... To-day, things may begin to be different ... and one day, men may become the conscious creators of an open society, and thereby of a greater part of their own fate."¹ Marx (even Popper does not deny this, as we shall see later) certainly does not consider that man cannot become the conscious creator of social relations. Marx's proposition that the essence of the individual is the sum total of social relations refers simply to the unity of the individual and the social. It certainly does not mean that social relations enslave the individual. On the contrary, historical materialism theoretically substantiates the regularity of the transition from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom. In practice communism destroys the social relations which engender a fatalistic world outlook. This active essence of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook is entirely ignored by Popper, who asserts that Marx's "radical", i.e., extremely fatalistic "historicism" is linked with the Hegelian conception of the socio-historical

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, p. 94.

process. Marx, he writes, was influenced by "Hegel's platonising collectivism, his theory that the state and the nation is more 'real' than the individual".¹

Here too Popper is over-simplifying Marx's attitude to Hegel in the extreme. For the German idealist, society is the embodiment of the "absolute spirit", and the state is the "earthly-divine essence" as a result of which the social essence of man, the unity of the individual and society is interpreted mystically as the manifestation of the identity of being and thinking, earthly and divine, i.e., in the final analysis, in the spirit of religious fatalism. There is not and cannot be anything of the sort in the case of Marx, who gives a materialist interpretation to the social nature of the individual and sees society not as the embodiment of the "absolute spirit", but as the product of human interaction, the material conditions of which have been created by people themselves throughout the course of social history.

Popper, it is true, does not object to Marx's proposition that society is the product of human interaction. He is even ready to agree with him, but only if it is accepted that people choose (create) arbitrarily the form of this interaction, that is, the form of society. And since Marx stresses the opposite, namely, that people are not free in their choice of this or that social form, the existence of which is conditioned by the given level of development of productive forces, Popper ascribes an extreme fatalism to the founder of scientific socialist ideology.

As Popper sees it, the materialist solution of the fundamental philosophical question relating to social life (that social life determines social consciousness) condemns man to adjust himself slavishly to circumstances and deprives him of spiritual freedom. Here too Popper sees the same terrible fatalism, tribalistic myth, fettering man's hands and feet. In fact, however, a careful reading of the Marxist propositions quoted by Popper shows clearly that they not only do not lead to fatalism, but that they scientifically demolish this anti-scientific conception.

If the consciousness of people reflects objective reality, this makes it a real force in their conscious and purposeful activity. This reflection of reality is the indispensable con-

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, p. 99.

dition for their freedom. This important aspect may be ignored only by a subjective idealist who regards the very recognition of objective reality and its reflection in man's consciousness as a suppression of the individual.

Lenin, in his criticism of Nikolai Mikhailovsky's sociological idealism, pointed out that "one of the favourite hobby-horses of the subjective philosopher is the idea of the conflict between determinism and morality, between historical necessity and the significance of the individual".¹ These words are perfectly applicable to Popper, who assumes that recognition of historical determinism is incompatible with recognition of personal responsibility and, consequently, morality.

Popper credits Marx with the indisputable service of having freed sociology from the psychologism prevalent in preceding sociological doctrines, and of bringing to the forefront the study of the economic conditions of people's lives and material production.²

But here too, in Popper's opinion, Marx's sense of proportion betrayed him, because he turned economics into the basis of social development, the determining motive force and source of social transformations. Popper regards economics, the study of economic relations, production and material values, as only one of the factors determining human behaviour. Thus, he reproaches Marx for not adopting the viewpoint of the "theory of factors", i.e., that eclectic and ultimately idealistic position which Marx brilliantly refuted.

Popper states that "there is an interaction between economic conditions and ideas, and not simply a unilateral dependence of the latter on the former".³

There is no need to show that Marxism fundamentally rejects the conception of "unilateral dependence" ascribed to it by Popper. It more than recognises, it makes a special study of the interaction between the economic basis and its political, legal and ideological superstructure. But Marxism does not confine itself to examining this interaction. It reveals its basis, the source in which ideas and political institutions are rooted. Marx's teaching, far from dooming people to passivity, summons the working people to fight, arms them with a definite programme, an ideological weapon of struggle.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 159.

² K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, p. 104.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

Therefore, Popper declares that as well as fatalism there is another, contradictory element inherent in Marxism, namely, "activism". From this he deduces that Marx's teaching contains an insoluble contradiction which is so essential that without it Marxism simply cannot be understood. "In my opinion," writes Popper, "Marxism and its influence cannot be appreciated unless we recognise this dualism."¹ Thus, on the one hand, Popper tries to prove that Marx "had practically forbidden all social technology which he denounced as Utopian" and, on the other hand, he ascribes to Marxism "Utopian social engineering" which is basically incompatible, to quote Popper, with the materialist interpretation of history. In this connection he notes: "Marx's vision of the 'kingdom of freedom', i.e. of a partial but equitable liberation of men from the bondage of their material nature, might rather be described as idealistic."²

So it transpires that Marx is a materialist only to the extent to which he regards the history of mankind as the development of the "kingdom of necessity". But as soon as he goes over to the "kingdom of freedom" he is, in Popper's opinion, renouncing the materialist interpretation of history and turning to idealism. This idealism, holds Marx's critic, is rooted in the Marxist solution to the fundamental problem of philosophy, because Marx does not reject the reality of the ideal, the spiritual. "Although, theoretically, mind was to Marx apparently only another *form* (or another aspect...) of matter, in practice it is different from matter, since it is *another form of it*."³

This statement of Popper's clearly illustrates his oversimplified interpretation of the essence of materialism. He assumes that materialism is the rejection of the existence of mind. He attempts to ascribe to all materialism the mistake of vulgar materialism. And on discovering that Marx regards mind as separate from matter, as the non-material product of matter, its reflection, Popper promptly exclaims that this is dualism. Yet dualism consists not in recognising the existence of mind, but in accepting its independence of matter. This is obvious to anyone who has studied the history of philosophy.

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, p. 102.

² *Ibid.*, p. 104.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

Marxism, as we know, regards the material life of society as the basis of the spiritual life of society. Here again Popper "discovers" idealism in the fact that Marx attached great importance to the spiritual life of society, to the intellectual development of the individual. Marx, he says, "cherished the spiritual world, the 'kingdom of freedom' and the spiritual side of 'human nature', as much as any Christian dualist.... With Hegel he thinks that freedom is the aim of historical development. With Hegel he identifies the kingdom of freedom with that of man's mental life. But he recognises that we are not purely spiritual beings; that we are not fully free.... This, I believe, is the central idea of Marx's 'view of life'."¹

This quotation shows that Popper does not simply set out Marx's teaching, but immediately distorts it. He not only presents Marx's materialist propositions as being dualist and idealist. Independently of any philosophical assessment of Marx's teaching, Popper exhibits a chronic inability to provide an objective, factual exposition of the ideas which he is criticising. This is why the propositions of Marx and Engels concerning the relationship between the kingdom of necessity and the kingdom of freedom appear, in Popper's exposition, to bear witness to an attempt by Marxism to combine materialism with idealism.

Here too, as elsewhere, it is obvious that Popper is fundamentally distorting the dialectical relationship between freedom and necessity and, in particular, their dialectic in the history of mankind. Engels showed that each step in the progressive development of society is also a step forward in man's mastery of nature. But in an antagonistic society man's mastery of man and man's mastery of nature are two sides of one and the same process, because here exploitation is the historically necessary social form of the development of productive forces. Therefore, alongside the liberation of man from the elemental forces of nature there is a constant (as long as private ownership of the means of production exists) enslavement of man by the forces of social development. It was in this sense that in *Anti-Dühring* Engels called antagonistic societies the "kingdom of necessity".²

¹ K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Vol. 2, pp. 103-104.

² F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 336.

The communist reconstruction of society puts an end to the enslavement of people by the elemental forces of social development, to the exploitation of man by man, and the sway of social relations over people. It was in this sense that Engels called communism the "kingdom of freedom". Only an outright falsifier of Marxism who ignores the Marxist proposition that freedom does not eliminate necessity, could regard the concept of the kingdom of freedom as a rejection of the materialist interpretation of history. Engels also emphasised that freedom does not mean man's independence of nature, of objective regularity or necessity. It means understanding the laws of nature and social development and practical mastery of those laws.

Let us now sum up. Popper took on a task beyond his capabilities, the task of criticising the Marxist theory of social development without understanding the principles of Marxist philosophy and without mastering the Marxist interpretation of such basic concepts as materialism, dialectics, economics, etc. At first he accuses Marx of reducing historical study to prophecy and gloomy fatalism. Then he is forced to admit that Marx's teaching is a theoretical justification of revolutionary activity. And here he declares Marxist theory to be dualistic.

Popper knows full well that an understanding of the laws of nature enables people to master its elemental forces. But he categorically refuses to admit that the laws of social development and an understanding of them are the basis of purposeful social activity. This contradiction in Popper's views (a contradiction which he ascribes to Marx, however) is rooted in the distinction he draws between the natural and social sciences which he borrowed from the neo-Kantians and made one of the main points of departure in his critique of historical materialism and scientific communism. At the basis of this distinction lies the unfounded view that the concepts of laws and necessity are applicable only in the natural sciences. The application of these categories in the social sciences is called anti-scientific and, what is more, conducive to fatalism. However, on closer inspection the source of fatalism, according to Popper, turns out to be not so much "historicism", the attempt to predict the future or the conviction that certain social processes are necessary, as the recognition of the objective conditionality of human

actions, which in turn proceeds from the application of determinism and causality to history. It is no accident, therefore, that Popper in effect dismisses the principle of causality.¹

Popper's struggle against historicism which turns directly into struggle against Marxism is, in the last analysis, the struggle against the scientific interpretation of the development of society, its past history and the prospects for human development. Renouncing the progressive ideological traditions of bourgeois thinkers in the past, Popper attempts to establish a militant agnosticism closing the way to the future in place of Marx and his ideological predecessors (whom Popper calls the enemies of civilisation and the theoreticians of totalitarianism).

It goes without saying that Popper is not the only opponent of historicism in the camp of modern bourgeois ideologists. The time has passed when bourgeois ideologists tried to develop an historical approach to the phenomena of social life. Today the overwhelming majority of them reject or distort historicism, because it is indissolubly linked with recognition of the law-governed, progressive development of society, undermining the idea of perpetual capitalism and helping to explain the historical necessity of socialism. Popper's struggle against historicism expresses the profound crisis in bourgeois ideology, which in turn is a reflection of the general crisis of modern capitalism.

Chapter 3

EXISTENTIALISM AND THE FUTURE OF MANKIND

Existentialism, one of the most influential trends in modern bourgeois philosophy, also claims its own solution to the problem of the future of human society. This can be seen even in the titles of works by representatives of this trend.

¹ "In the sense of this analysis, all causal explanation of a singular event can be said to be historical in so far as the 'cause' is always described by singular initial conditions." Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, p. 144.

On the Origin and Goal of History is the title of one of the first post-war books by Karl Jaspers, the eminent exponent of German Christian existentialism. For his work *The Atomic Bomb and the Future of Mankind* he was awarded the Peace Prize in 1958, an annual award made by a society of West German booksellers and publishers. His book *Where Is the Bundesrepublik Going?* was published in 1966. In the above-mentioned works we find not only an exposition of this existentialist philosopher's ideas about the future, but also attempts to exert an active influence on people's minds and thus help in a definite way to bring about this future. Thus, in the first of the books mentioned above, Jaspers states: "I trust that my book will help to increase our awareness of the present.... The present is filled with the future, concealed within it, whose tendencies we make our own either by rejecting or accepting them. The second part attempts to discuss the present and the future.... The third part is to debate the meaning of history."¹

With regard to Jaspers' discussion of the "tendencies" and "meaning" of history, we shall see later how the existentialist philosophers try to deny the objective regularity of social development in general and the main substance of our age, the age of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, in particular. With regard to the future, Jaspers, like other bourgeois ideologists, is terrified by the approach of the communist future. And in the second of the books mentioned he makes an outright appeal for stepping up the arms race and giving atomic weapons to the Bundeswehr, seeing mankind's growing fear of the atomic bomb as the foundation for a peaceful future and a means of averting the "threat of communism".²

Several years later, however, he was compelled to admit the erroneous nature of his earlier views about the future and the danger of the political ideas which he defended in *The Atomic Bomb and the Future of Mankind*. "But the danger still remains, that the path to stronger control of the entrepreneur, of party oligarchy, coincides in the end with the path to dictatorship and increased danger of war," wrote

¹ Karl Jaspers, *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*, München, 1957, S. 5.

² Karl Jaspers, *Die Atombombe und die Zukunft des Menschen*, München, 1964.

Jaspers towards the end of his life. "Anyone who has grown old as a German, has experienced it twice (1914 and 1933) and fears that it could happen again a third time."¹ Thus, one of the theoreticians of Christian existentialism, confronted by the course of history, was forced to review his ideas of the present and future and turn from the abstract heights of the "philosophy of existence" to concrete reality. This is typical of many existentialists: either they adopt reactionary positions, proceeding from their idealistic ideas, and suffer inevitable failure, or the very logic of historical development compels them to review their stand and move closer to the progressive forces which really embody the future. Thus, the evolution of Jaspers' concrete views on the future actually confirms the theoretical insolvency and reactionary political nature of the outwardly often very abstract ideas of German Christian existentialism.

The founder of German "atheistic" existentialism, Martin Heidegger, in his definitive work *Being and Time* (1927) gave in extremely abstract form the fullest philosophical substantiation of existentialist "ontology".² Rejecting the dialectico-materialist interpretation of time as the universal objective form of developing matter's being the author of this work criticises, first and foremost, the recognition of objective laws of social development. Having adopted this false theoretical position, Heidegger was confronted in practice with German fascism in 1933 and not only failed to perceive the catastrophic effect it was bound to have on Germany's future, but allied himself with the nazi cause. He actually joined Hitler's National-Socialist party and urged the German intelligentsia to support the barbarous programme of the fascist dictatorship and the inhuman policies of German imperialism.

Unlike Heidegger, the famous French atheist existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre wrote his first important philosophical work *L'être et le Néant* (*Being and Non-Being*) in 1943, while participating in the anti-fascist movement of the Resistance and fighting for a new future for France. Immediately after the liberation of the country he even tried to present his version of existentialism as the basis of the true

¹ Karl Jaspers, *Wohin treibt die Bundesrepublik?*, München, 1966, S. 279, 281.

² M. Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, Tübingen, 1927.

humanism of the future. *L'Existentialisme est un humanisme* (*Existentialism is Humanism*) was the title of one of his first post-war books. But it is also characteristic of the French existentialist that his philosophical views on the future of mankind conflict with the practical struggle for a better future and a true humanism. With an inconsistency typical of the existentialists, this very same Sartre varies between playing an active part in the peace movement and the campaign against the shameful wars of the imperialists in Indochina and Algeria and falling prey to anti-communist ideology, turning the full force of his criticism against the communist and working-class movement, the socialist countries and Marxist-Leninist theory. His book *A Critique of Dialectical Reason*¹ is a clear illustration of this dualism. On the one hand, he actually recognises Marxism as the only philosophy of the future in so many words, but, on the other, he tries to substitute his own version of existentialist revisionism for dialectical and historical materialism. It must, unfortunately, be said that existentialist ideology has prevented and still is preventing certain progressively minded members of the bourgeois intelligentsia from committing themselves consistently to the revolutionary socialist working-class movement and true Marxism-Leninism.

What is the theoretical insolvency of the existentialist views of the future and the basic cause of the failure of their practical attempts to influence the course of social development? Specifically existentialist views of the future are based on a peculiar interpretation of human existence and alienation, on making fetish of the subjective nature of consciousness and corresponding attempts to substantiate religious faith.

Like other tendencies in modern subjective idealism, existentialism rejects the materialist answer to the fundamental question of philosophy, in general, and the dialectico-materialist interpretation of the relation between social being and consciousness, in particular. At the same time, however, the existentialists have developed their own specific arguments concerning these cardinal philosophical questions on the basis of distinguishing between the alleged primary free,

¹ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Critique de la raison dialectique*, Vol. I, *Théorie des ensembles pratiques*, Paris, 1960.

subjective consciousness of human beings (existence) and those "phenomena of alienated social consciousness" in which this consciousness is forced to "have its being". In *Being and Time* Heidegger developed an existentialist "ontology", that is, a doctrine of being, in the form of some "phenomenology", i.e., a doctrine of the "phenomena" of human consciousness. It is not being or time in themselves, but only human ideas and concepts of being and time which interest this founder of existentialist philosophy. The existentialists see man's future as depending not on objective laws of development, but exclusively on the ideas and concepts of the future and its laws which prevail in human consciousness and in accordance with which people act and thereby realise these concepts and ideas. The declared aim of existentialism is to free people's consciousness from the grip of false and alienated concepts. In one of his earliest works now rarely quoted, *On the Concept of Time in the Historical Sciences* (1916), Heidegger openly urged that the teaching and exposition of history should be freed from views, prevalent in the historical sciences, about objective time and the objective laws of society's development in time.

Ten years later he attempted to put this into practice in his main work. Man's future, Heidegger asserts in *Being and Time*, depends exclusively on himself, on the decisions which he is making every instant and on actions which correspond entirely to these decisions. But the activity and decisions of each person depend on how he conceives his being, his past, present and future, at a given moment. If a person understands his existence as developing in accordance with objective laws, this means that he will act accordingly and realise his idea of the future. Trying to "free" man from what he considers to be the false ideas of the laws of social development, the existentialist bourgeois ideologist declares all such views and concepts to be the product of the "alienated consciousness". Turning the concrete historical phenomena of bourgeois ideology and commodity fetishism into absolutes the existentialist philosopher depicts all social consciousness as "false" and declares all the objective substance of consciousness to be incompatible with "free existence". Distinguishing between individual and social consciousness (and on this basis between the individual and society as a whole the existentialist urges man to free himself from

social consciousness and objective truth and thus become the "free creator" of his future, outside all objective laws of development. He criticises the "phenomena" of everyday consciousness, seeing them as the result of the alienation prevalent in society. Thus, the existentialist replaces true scientific criticism of the concrete historical principles and manifestations of capitalist alienation by abstract anthropological constructions relating to consciousness which is eternally and insuperably doomed. Thus, existentialist "ontology", appearing as the "phenomenology" of consciousness, tries to provide a philosophical basis for its version of the subjective-idealist rejection of the primary nature of social being, the objective laws of social development, and the objective substance of true scientific views and concepts of the laws of development.

Rejection of the objective laws of development is supplemented in existentialist philosophy by regarding the subjective nature of consciousness as an absolute. The subjective self-consciousness of man is not simply a passive, meditative reflection of his own existence, but is always a kind of attitude by man towards his existence. To quote Heidegger, the difference between man's being and the being of an inanimate object is that man is constantly aware of his eventual death, that he is afraid of death and through fear of the "transition to non-being" creates for himself the illusory idea of unceasing being in time, of a law-governed future and the possibility of delaying or even evading the "end of being". Thus, instead of a clear and calm view of one's future, there arises in the consciousness "worry" or "anxiety" about the continuation of one's being, that specifically human subjectivity which characterises man's self-consciousness. The very idea of a law-governed future is regarded by Heidegger simply as the product of the "alienated" means of existence of initially free subjective self-consciousness when it has become dominated by "ordinary" social consciousness and itself begun to exist in the form of the "phenomena" of this alienated consciousness.

A similar "ontological" structure is developed by Sartre in his *Being and Non-Being*. He distinguishes between the conscious existing *for themselves* of human beings and the dead existing *in themselves* of the things and phenomena of nature, and states that time "comes into" the world by "ex-

istence for oneself". "Universal time comes into the world by existence for oneself."¹

Further he writes that "the future is that which I should be, since I cannot be it". In other words, the future is a "project" of subjective desire engendered by fear of "nothingness", the threat of the transition to "non-being". The consciousness interprets its subjective "project" of the future as a result of certain objective laws. The successful realisation of these "projects" is not proof of the objectivity of the laws of development, but only the result of the fact that many people have interpreted their future in the same way, based their "projects" on the same faith in certain laws created by them and acted accordingly. One need only free people's minds from this faith for the "imaginary objectivity" of the laws to vanish. Thus existentialist philosophy portrays the future as the result of purely subjective "projects", as the product of people's "false" faith in the "imaginary" laws of development, as the sum total of people's activity based on similar "false" concepts and views about the law-governed development of society.

Whereas Heidegger sees subjective self-consciousness as based on abstract "fear of death" and "anxiety" about existence, Sartre gives the same subjectivity a more concrete basis in the form of "hunger", the awareness of "insufficiency", "lack" and the need for commitment, for taking an active stand to overcome this "non-being" (lack of food, freedom, rights, etc.). In the most "left" of the existentialists, Sartre, we also find the most pronounced criticism of the sham "rationalism" of bourgeois society and many real manifestations of capitalist alienation, including those apologetic bourgeois theories of the future which interpret the objectivity of the laws of social development as the "firmness" of the laws of capitalism. Yet, while rejecting this evolutionary-reformist, false interpretation of objectivity, Sartre also rejects the revolutionary-dialectic, scientific-materialist interpretation of the laws of social development.

From the very beginning Marxist-Leninist philosophy set itself the aim of revolutionary transformation of the world based on scientific knowledge of the world. Overcoming the contemplative-passive approach of metaoaphysical material-

¹ J.-P. Sartre, *L'être et le Néant*, Paris, 1943, p. 255.

ism to reality, dialectical and historical materialism included socio-historical material practice as an object of study, seeing this as the basis of knowledge and criteria of truth. Therefore, in this philosophy the subjective, active aspect of man and consciousness is developed in detail. Man creates and transforms the world, but on the basis of the laws of development of this world, not on the basis of subjective arbitrariness and voluntarist "projects". If man has not understood the objective laws of development, he acts as an elemental force. The distinctive feature of the communist future is that it emerges only on the basis of the conscious revolutionary creative activity of the working masses led by the party armed with scientific theory. This social creativeness is based on and proceeds from recognition and knowledge of the objective laws of the dialectic of social development.

By metaphysically rending apart and contrasting objective laws and human activity, objective truth and the subjective aspects of consciousness, existentialist philosophy dooms man to ignorance of objective laws and subjection to their blind operation, to helplessness in the face of the powerful organisational force of state-monopoly capitalism of our time, to inability to become a truly conscious organised revolutionary and the creator of his own future. Furthermore, some "ultra-left" existentialists bluntly reject in the name of "freedom of thought" any ideological-political alliance of revolutionaries, any organisation and discipline of fighters for a better future. And in so doing they objectively serve the forces of imperialism and reaction which oppose this future. They weaken, disrupt and demoralise the only force in the modern world capable of and called to put an end to all alienation and all slavery—the toiling masses led by the working class in the struggle for peace, democracy, social progress and socialism. It is no accident that existentialist ideas are widespread among anarchist students in capitalist countries and representatives of the so-called New Left.

Herbert Marcuse, the American philosopher of German origin who is a pupil of Heidegger, has attempted to give an existentialist interpretation of Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*. He sees the allegedly insuperable basis of alienated consciousness and alienated existence

not in the historically rooted and revolutionarily surmountable contradictions of capitalist society, but in the age-long essence of human labour which turns people into objects, things. In his article "Existentialism. Comment on Jean-Paul Sartre's *L'être et le Néant*", Marcuse praises the French existentialist philosopher very highly and asserts that it is existentialism, and not Marxism, which has performed the service of formulating those features of the future that would correspond to "free existence".¹ And one of Marcuse's followers, a leader of the anarchist group of Paris students, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, announced in 1968, without any abstract philosophical constructions and frankly allying himself with anti-communist ideology, that the Communist parties were the main obstacle to the triumph of the existentialist revolt and anarchy, and the main "enemy" of a future society of free individuals.²

Thus, the political degradation of those who, carried away by existentialist ideas, reject the Marxist-Leninist science of the laws of social development and the struggle under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist parties for the communist future of mankind, turns the full circle. By the logic of the class struggle they find themselves in the camp of the enemies of social progress. Heidegger served nazism, Jaspers himself admitted that his advocacy of atomic armament was mistaken, and Sartre, by his "critique" of dialectical materialism and communism, objectively served the split in the united front of the anti-imperialist forces.

Neither the abstract philosophical constructions of existentialism, nor its concrete-political ideas provide an acceptable solution to the problem of the future. In fact this future is being won in the prolonged and difficult organised class struggle and in the building of a real, new, socialist society. Negative rejection of the present and criticism of the "phenomena" of bourgeois consciousness and capitalist alienation are no substitute for positive scientific prediction and the victorious revolutionary action of the masses on the basis of this prediction.

¹ H. Marcuse, "Existentialismus. Bemerkungen zu Jean-Paul Sartres *L'être et le Néant*" in *Kultur und Gesellschaft* 2, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1965.

² D. and G. Cohn-Bendit, *Linksradikalismus—Gewaltkur gegen die Alterskrankheit des Kommunismus*, Hamburg, 1968.

It is typical of existentialist theoreticians that they frequently demonstrate their reactionary nature in private questions as well. As far back as the immediate post-war years Heidegger lectured in West Germany against the "demoniacal development of technology" and published his lectures on Nietzsche written during the fascist period. He challenged the future age of technical progress, the scientific and technological revolution, with his own existentialist interpretation of the irrational ideas of Nietzsche's philosophy. Jaspers appeared on West German television, urging millions of viewers to seek salvation in "philosophical faith" and to rely on divine providence beyond human comprehension. Marcuse and Sartre reject the revolutionary role of the proletariat and Communist parties, preach a profoundly pessimistic view of the future and themselves contribute to disunity and dissension in the anti-imperialist forces. Placing their hopes on the intellectual élite and regarding the inevitable difficulties, contradictions and mistakes of socialist construction as absolutes, the existentialist ideologists are deflecting the true creators of the future from the struggle. They are introducing revisionist ideas into the working-class movement, and attempting to "supplement" Marxist philosophy with the ideas of abstract philosophical anthropology or psychoanalysis, the existentialism of Sartre or Heidegger. The theoreticians of the "philosophy of existence", the anarchist wing of the New Left and the Right-wing opportunists present themselves as the authors of various "new models" of socialism, various versions of "socialism with a human face", helping imperialism by this ideological subversion. For this reason it is essential that the true socialist future should be fought for and defended in the struggle against the inconsistent attempts of existentialism to provide a solution to this problem.

In many countries where religious survivals are still strong existentialism has attempted not only to revive the philosophical basis of religion, but to impose its own picture of the future from the standpoint of religious existentialism. In France, Gabriel Marcel has even developed his own "Catholic existentialism" which, incidentally, was condemned by the Vatican in 1951, forcing Marcel to rename his philosophy "Socratism". Marcel seeks the basic affirmation of the existence of God in man's direct knowledge of his own exis-

tence, his own self. For Marcel human subjectivity, subjective self-consciousness and faith are a manifestation of the transcendental nature of God. In a paper entitled "The existential aspect of human dignity" which he read at the 13th International Philosophical Congress in Mexico in 1963, Marcel urged that the future be built not on the basis of rational scientific theories, but on human moral qualities which are the manifestation of God.

Jaspers too, in his Protestant version of Christian existentialism, linked his hopes for a better future with man's rejection of "false belief" in science and with the triumph of a purely subjective individual, irrational but passionate "philosophical belief" in God. Similar attempts at an existentialist substantiation of faith going back to the Danish religious mystic of the early 19th century, Søren Kierkegaard, are also being made by modern Protestant theologists (Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, Paul Tillich and others). Karl Barth, for example, urges rejection of apologies for capitalism and narrow-minded anti-socialism in Christian theology. In his multi-volumed work *Church Dogma* expounding the idea of existentialist "dialectical theology" he states outright that a socialist future does not necessarily contradict the ideas of Christianity.

In common with the many schools of "Christian socialism", some exponents of religious existentialism and "dialectical theology" frankly admit that the future is on the side of socialism, but try to challenge atheism and scientific communism with their version of the existentialist substantiation of the future of socialism. Basically this version is a religious-ethical "socialism" and not a particularly original one. Like "atheistic" existentialism the religious representatives of this trend reject the recognition and cognition of the objective laws of social development in general and the laws of the class struggle and socialist revolution in particular. They explain science and technology, rationalism and materialism as products of the "sinful" subjective consciousness of "fallen" man, from which it is already impossible to free oneself entirely, and which lie at the root of "alienated" existence, but over which each man can obtain "inner" mastery by basing himself on the freedom of existentialist solutions and on the freedom to "believe". They take the view that "faith" liberates consciousness from "false" subjec-

tivity, from purely selfish interests and concerns, from "mistaken" belief in science, and makes it capable of building its own future on moral principles freely chosen by it at any given moment. According to them, it is faith, not science, which rescues man from the mistakes, arbitrariness and voluntarism rooted in human existence. There is no need to show that the religious version of existentialism is just as inconsistent and reactionary in its attempts to solve the problem of the future as the other forms of religion in general. By distracting the working man from a scientific understanding of the essence and laws of the development of class society, religious existentialism like its "atheistic" counterpart, is objectively serving the interests of capital. This does not exclude the fact that some supporters of religious existentialism take an active part in the struggle for peace, democracy and the interests of the working people.

Thus, a critical examination of the theoretical structures of existentialism concerning the subjectivity of human consciousness, its alienated existence in the form of "phenomena" prevailing in the social consciousness, on which are constructed attempts to provide an original interpretation of the problem of the future and to exert a definite influence on ideas about the future, enables the following deductions to be made.

Existentialism does not and cannot provide an acceptable solution to the problem of the future. By denying the existence of the objective laws of social development and rejecting the organised class struggle for a communist future, the existentialists *volens nolens* are assisting the enemies of this future.

Existentialism's criticism of certain real contradictions and unsolved problems of present-day capitalism may be regarded as a relatively strong and influential aspect of this trend. But existentialism is incapable of revealing the true essence of these contradictions and the ways of solving them in the interests of a better future. By turning labour force into a commodity and splitting society into antagonistic classes, by forcing the prevailing bourgeois ideology on every member of society, capitalism has engendered those contradictions which existentialism reflects as age-long, insurmountable contradictions between man and society, between "existence" and alienated existence, between primary free

self-consciousness and the prevailing social consciousness. Only communist society is capable of solving these contradictions. Only the theory of scientific communism points the real way to this future. Only the Marxist-Leninist party, armed with this theory, is capable of organising and leading a victorious campaign against state-monopoly capital which is striving with all its might to prevent this. By rejecting the theory and practice of the socialist revolution, existentialism is acting as a trend of bourgeois ideology and an enemy of social progress. Therefore, existentialist criticism in general, its unsound claims to possess its own solution to the problem of the future and resistance to its influence are an integral part of the struggle for a truly splendid future for mankind.

Chapter 4

THE TEILHARDIST CONCEPTION OF FUTURE OF MANKIND

Among the various philosophical futurological theories a special place is occupied by Teilhardist views of the future of mankind. The steady increase in the number of supporters and followers of Teilhardism—a special trend in modern Catholicism, named after its founder, the French palaeontologist, anthropologist and theologian Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955)—justifies an examination of the Teilhardist conception of the future.

Whatever fashionable bourgeois ideas about the future one takes—whether it is the forecasts of Walt Rostow, Daniel Bell, Herman Kahn, Jean Fourastié or John Galbraith—these schemes, for all their differences and varying shades, are united by one characteristic feature: they all extrapolate into the future the world outlook, morality and social utopias of bourgeois society, modified in the spirit of the “technotronic age”. Teilhardism also divorces scientific and technical progress from the social conditions of its realisation, turns it into the decisive factor for reaching a better future, and thereby shows its similarity to other bourgeois concepts of the future. Unlike most bourgeois ideologists, Teilhard did not construct his picture of mankind's future on an extrapolation of the features of present-day bourgeois society. He tended rather towards the doctrine of a “third

way", free from the defects of capitalism and socialism and cut out according to the abstract measurements of "true human nature".

In Teilhardism we find the tendency characteristic of modern Catholicism to show that Catholicism is not organically linked with the capitalist system and therefore cannot bear responsibility for the defects of that society, that it is capable of defending social ideals which do not contradict socialism. Expressing this tendency, one of the most famous Teilhardists, C. Cuénot, notes that socialism "contains nothing incompatible with Christianity, which is not structurally linked with capitalism".¹ He writes: "In short, the social and economic infrastructure defined by Marxism, if it is technically more viable than the other systems, does not contradict Marxism in any way."²

Teilhardism is also different from other trends of Christian thought in that it treats the problems of mankind's future in optimistic and humanistic tones. At the same time it claims to create a new, all-embracing system of humanism, in which there is a synthesis of both the earthly and the heavenly striving of man, love of man and love of God.

The accents are changed substantially in this conception of humanism compared with the orthodox Christian interpretation of humanism. The pivotal point here is reliance not on divine mercy and the heavenly powers, but on joining the natural forces of man with the superhuman powers of God. The Teilhardists believe that this joining is possible only if there is rapprochement and collaboration between science and Christianity in understanding man and all his strivings. Moreover (and this is a most significant point) man is recognised as having a special position, which Christianity never credited him with before. As the pivot and highest stage of evolution man becomes the centre of the development of the cosmos (cosmogenesis), its main active force, and is therefore transformed into a co-participant in the divine act of transforming the world. Anthropocentrism blends into a single whole with Christocentrism, as a result of which,

¹ C. Cuénot, "Teilhard et le marxisme", *Europe*, Mars-Avril, 1965, p. 179.

² Ibid., p. 178.

the Teilhardists maintain, the artificially created and totally unjustified gulf between the followers of man and the followers of God is bridged.

Thus, from the Teilhardist point of view turning to God does not mean renouncing the world. On the contrary, it means that each person should "become immersed" in the world, take an active part in transforming and creating the world, and devote to this all the clarity of his thought, all the passion of his love, all the force of his energy. This is the distinctive feature of Teilhardism, the basic object of which—man—appears as the connecting link between the material cosmos and the spiritual sphere, its peak and crowning point—the "Omega-point", God.

Maintaining and strengthening his faith in the value of a supernatural, Divine order, Teilhard at the same time strives to maintain and enrich all earthly human values in the single conception of the "human meaning" which lies at the basis of his humanism. This unconditional faith in the earthly strivings of man, faith in his better future, constitutes the dividing line which marks Teilhardism off to a considerable extent from orthodox Christianity and gives its followers grounds for speaking of its "profound optimism".

This optimism was far from being contemplative. Thus, Teilhard frequently made strong criticism of those who talk about "the collapse of civilisation or the imminent end of the world". Such frames of mind are extremely widespread today in bourgeois philosophy and sociology, including Christian trends. He called them defeatist and said "this defeatism seems to be the most dangerous temptation of the present time".¹

Of course, said Teilhard, modern mankind, which has been sucked into the whirlpool of social, scientific and technological change, is experiencing a crisis, but creative as well as destructive forces are operating in this critical situation. It is these creative forces which determine the trend towards the future, which was depicted by him in the image of "planetised mankind". This concept of "planetised mankind" opens up a new aspect of Teilhard's "Omega-point": it also appears as the new, perfect society, visible on the far horizon

¹ P. Teilhard de Chardin, *Construire la terre*, Paris, 1958, p. 5.

of human history, a society in which human reason will have total sway over matter and social relationships.

Extolling Teilhard's optimism as "new", "radical", "profound", "extreme", his followers mainly stress the fact that he does not confine himself to hoping for a better future, but urges people to act in the name of this future, to unite together with the aim of perfecting society. But they believe this perfection can become effective and stable only if it is inspired by Christian ideals.

Thus, the optimistic tenor of the Teilhardist world outlook merges with its religious tenor and its optimism turns out to be religious optimism. The Austrian Catholic theologian and psychologist, E. Grünewald, calls (not without good grounds) the optimism peculiar to Teilhardist philosophising the expression of religious hope. He sees an original "evolutionistic imperative" as the most concentrated formula of this religious hope. The main components of this evolutionistic imperative, according to Grünewald, are four basic appeals: more truth, more love, more community and more independence.¹

These abstract, humanistic appeals disseminated by the Teilhardists were intended by them to open up a new path to a better future. Naturally, this humanism is extremely abstract and outside history. However, the concept, in spite of all its mystical religiosity, abstract contemplative, supra-class and extra-class nature, contains clear notes of optimism and faith in man and his future. The Teilhardists see this faith in man and his future as a platform for the rapprochement of Teilhardist and Marxist thought. "Take the two extremes around you at this very moment: here is a Marxist and there a Christian, both convinced believers of their particular doctrine, but also both, one assumes, profoundly inspired by the same faith in Man.... Pushed to the end, the two trajectories will surely finish by coming together,"² said Teilhard.

But recognition of the positive significance of Marxism is combined in Teilhardism with appeals to "overcome" Marxism (mainly communism) by the Christianisation of Marx-

¹ E. Grünewald, "Tiefenpsychologische Aspekte zur Situation der 'Versuchung'", *Gott in Welt*, Bd. II, Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1964, S. 574.

² P. Teilhard de Chardin, *L'avenir de l'homme*, Paris, 1959, p. 242.

ist thought. Moreover, it is acknowledged that "the only way to vanquish communism is to present Christ as he should be: not as the opium (or derivative) but as the essential motor of a hominisation which can only be completed energetically in a world open at the summit".¹

In these appeals to "conquer" Marxism, alongside the anti-communist motifs common to all bourgeois ideologists there are some specifically Teilhardist ones. The first is that the Marxist interpretation of religion as the opium of the people is rejected as inconsistent, and religion is elevated to the rank of the only guarantee of true humanisation. It is also maintained that Marxism is striving only for material progress and ignores the spiritual aspect of man, as a result of which the latter is "enslaved in the fetters of the anarchy of thought". A scheme for "improving" Marxism is constructed on the basis of this distortion of the essence of Marxism by adding to it "recognition of the role of the spiritual factor" (which, incidentally, it has never denied). The total inconsistency and reactionary nature of this social utopism reveals itself clearly in the fact that, unable to find real paths and forces for perfecting human society, Teilhard urges the augmentation of universal love which unites man with God and leads to the God-man ideal society on the far horizon of the future.

Here too Teilhard presents his second recipe for the "Christianisation of Marxism": rejecting the Marxist criterion of the class division of society and replacing it by the elusive spirit of universal love which is proclaimed the only "pure energy" of anthropogenesis and cosmogenesis. "From this point of view," he says, "the old Marxist division into producers and consumers has had its day—or at least it was only an inaccurate approximation. What finally tends to separate people into two classes today is not class but spirit—the spirit of movement."² Only he who grasps this spirit which coincides with the movement of man towards a God-man society, the Teilhardists maintain, can act today as the bearer of mankind's true spiritual progress. This means, however, that the class division of society is

¹ C. Cuénot, *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin—les grandes étapes de son évolution*, Paris, 1958, p. 448.

² P. Teilhard de Chardin, *L'avenir de l'homme*, p. 174.

not simply denied by them, but replaced by the reactionary ~~idea of the existence of the elect, the aristocrats of the spirit, who understand the real perspectives of the "phenomenon of man"~~. Noting this feature as being extremely important for understanding the sociological concepts of Teilhardism, the French Jesuit E. Rideau writes: "...however, one observes that Teilhard is somewhat contaminated by the biological laws of selection and aristocratic hierarchy in his ideal of a social structure directed by the élites."¹

What could be more utopian and more reactionary than to replace the theory of the class struggle in an age of increasing antagonism between the world systems of capitalism and socialism by the concept of "biological selection" and aristocratic elitism which is scientifically and sociologically inconsistent!

The Teilhardists present a third recipe for the "perfection" of Marxism by Christianising it. This recipe is connected with the transformation of the Marxist perspective of humanism. Recognising the indisputable advantages of Marxist humanism (belief in the future of mankind, social progress, etc.), Teilhard at the same time maintained that this humanism is too "earthly", impersonal, not sufficiently elevated in the sense of an ideal and "incapable of giving Man the stimulating (and indispensable) confidence to advance towards a supremely desirable objective ... because of its depersonalising collectivisation of individuals."² Therefore, Teilhard believes, it is essential to supplement Marxist humanism, striving forward, by Christian humanism, striving upward, and to create on this basis a new model of humanism which will inspire people with the Christian ideal of the future embodied in the concrete image of Christ.

This "argument" is clearly totally unfounded. Marxists do not deny, of course, that religion is capable to a certain extent of inspiring man to attain this or that ideal. "Religion gives man an ideal," said Lenin in his conspectus on Feuerbach's book *Lectures on the Essence of Religion*. "Man needs an ideal, but a human one corresponding to nature

¹ E. Rideau, *La pensée du Pierre Teilhard de Chardin*, Paris, 1965, p. 254.

² P. Teilhard de Chardin, "Critique", *Europe*, p. 117.

and not a supernatural ideal...."¹ The religious forms of humanism, including the Teilhardist one, present man with the ideal of an illusory future, that is, an unearthly, imaginary ideal with no real basis in reality.

If the Teilhardist conception of the future were confined to a religious interpretation of the future of mankind, it would be unlikely to have aroused such widespread response in the hearts of Left-wing Catholics. Another essential feature of Teilhardism is its attempt to fuse the natural science and religious approach to all problems, including the future of society. Teilhard himself was not only a religious thinker, but also an eminent naturalist, an evolutionist specialising in the field of biology. But all his attempts to ground religious views of the future in the natural sciences were confined primarily to inventing a pseudo-scientific terminology with a biological ring about it to describe social processes. Teilhardism strives to approach the interpretation of social processes with biological yardsticks, from the angle of an exclusively biological examination of man, his place and role in society.

The history of the future of human society is constructed by Teilhard on the knowledge of the biological and physiological characteristics of man and is presented as a "world physiology of the organism" which includes mankind united on a world-wide scale. It is on this basis that the term "the biology of civilisation" emerges and acquires prime significance in Teilhardism, a term which is supposed to mean that the only true path of progress which corresponds entirely to human nature must be the socialisation of all "natural human particles" of our planet into a single organism without any class, national or racial distinctions—the planetisation of mankind. This planetisation is regarded by Teilhard as the "direct continuation of the process of evolution", as the highest stage of "biological synthesis".

This exclusively "biologising" approach to the problems of social development, which totally ignores the specific nature of the regularities of social life and is the main defect of Teilhardism, is elevated by his followers to the basic merit of the Teilhardist vision of the future since, in their opin-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 75.

ion, a generally meaningful norm of progress can be found "only in the biological aspect of human nature".¹

But since the Teilhardist conception of the future of society is based on the data of concrete sciences—biology, anthropology and neuro-physiology—the Teilhardists claim that in respect of its actual content and principles of construction it is close to Marxism which advocates the scientific understanding of social progress. What is more, some of them assert, the advantages of the evolutionist study of social phenomena "enable Teilhard to go further than Marx in understanding the human being, spiritual and personal, fruit of the earth, but also centre of the universe".²

It is precisely this "further" which contains the crux of the matter: the more social phenomena are deprived of their specific character and the more readily they are interpreted in the spirit of hypostasised biologism, the more removed the authors of these conceptions are from Marxism-Leninism as the only true methodology and theory of social progress. In the Teilhardist conception of progress, which views social development through the prism of biologism, all the injustice and shortcomings in social life which hamper the true flowering of the human personality, are seen as the result of ignorance or lack of understanding of the biological norms of social life, of everyday human life, and not as the result of the operation of definite social laws in a bourgeois class society developing in antagonistic contradictions. This biologisation of social life and social morality is regarded by the Teilhardists as a panacea for all social ills and as the absolute guarantee of the true humanisation of human life.

Yet the biological approach by virtue of its very nature never has led and never can lead to a correct understanding of human relations in society and, consequently, to a correct deduction about the means of improving these mutual relations. At best it degenerates simply into fruitless sentimental dreaming about the perfecting of abstract "human nature" (which is also typical of the so-called Left Teilhardists), at worst it leads to reactionary apologetic concepts

¹ P. Chauchard, *Quel avenir attend l'homme? Rencontre internationale de Royaumont*, 17-20 mai 1961, Paris, 1961, p. 205.

² R. Bissières et J. Vacherot, *Science? Seule esperance? Marx? Teilhard?*, Paris, 1967, p. 397.

of the permanent and immutable nature of the exploitative system.

Such an abstract approach to the problem of the future, which excludes all analysis of the trends of modern social development and confines itself to preaching the "biological convergence" of mankind to a single planetary organism, turns into a highly abstract, vague picture of the future, which is less of an hypothesis than a mystic belief that the human race will eventually become God itself. Naturally, Teilhard mentions the class conflicts of our age, but only to reject them as a deviation from the path of the spiritual development and unity of mankind. He is indignant about the arms race, but does not make the slightest attempt to understand the causes and origins of this social phenomenon. All his thoughts are concentrated on an abstract appeal for the unity of the human race. It is on this abstract, mystical platform, divorced from the real struggle for a real improvement of human life, that Teilhardism constructs its concept of a better future for mankind.

The main instrument for moving towards this aim is "socialisation" by which is meant the uniting of all human groups in a single social phenomenon. Teilhard regards socialisation, collectivisation and totalisation as the main stages and forms of uniting the thinking human mass into a single social organism, by means of which there is to be a constant increase in the solidarity of human groups and in the processes of integration and unification of increasingly broad communities with their eventual fusion in a single universal community.

Teilhard understands socialisation as the generalisation of the human masses, based on the intensification, multiplication and perfecting of the forms of mutual connections between people. The characteristic features of this process, to his mind, are the following: the increasing mutual intertwining of the human masses, the constant strengthening of economic ties, intellectual and financial unions, the joining together of political regimes, the awakening of activity "in the crowd of individuals and in the crowd of peoples" the increasing impossibility of isolated action and thinking.

He sees totalisation as the process of the psychic union of isolated human particles into a single whole. Of course,

7. Teilhardism gives this concept a totally different meaning from Marxism which strives towards social homogeneity.

The enrichment of the human consciousness in this process of people uniting in a single community will become effective, according to Teilhard, when it is governed not only by a rapprochement of minds but a rapprochement of hearts, the decisive role in which is to be played by man's "eternal striving" for unity with God. This all-embracing striving for unity develops according to the extent to which a man is aware that he is being drawn towards the Almighty and All-loving God—Christ, whom Teilhard identifies with the "Omega-point", void of anthropomorphical features and fulfilling the role of the "centre of centres", the "conscious pole of the world". In his conception anthropogenesis and planetisation as the supreme links in the evolution leading to the Omega-point are Christianised and culminate in pleromisation [from *pleroma* (Gr.)—fullness]—the embodiment of Christ in the evolutionising Universe.

According to Teilhard, Christ plays a dual role in the pleromisation process. On the one hand, he moves evolution forward or, as the Omega-point, draws it to himself through amorisation (universal love) and acts as Christ the motive force of evolution (*Christ évoluteur*), but on the other hand, he realises himself in the process of evolution in cosmic nature and acts as Christ who is subject to evolution.¹ This evolutionising Christ also appears in Teilhardism as a concrete form expressing the Christian ideal of the God-man stage which, it is claimed, is awaiting mankind in the dim and distant future. The more people are governed in their daily actions by the Christian principles of humility, loving one's neighbour, etc., say the Teilhardists, the more quickly they will be able to advance along the path of spiritual progress.

The Teilhardist view of the future of mankind which sees the sphere of consciousness, spiritual perfectionment, as the decisive factor for the progressive development of mankind, is unable by virtue of its idealism (biologism in the explanation of social phenomena is a manifestation of historical idealism) to show concrete ways and real social

¹ A. Gosztanyi, *Teilhard de Chardin. Cristianesimo ed evoluzione*, Florence, 1970, p. 201.

means of perfecting society. For all its apparent concreteness it is extremely abstract and utopian.

The ideal of the future predicted by Marxism, however, is highly concrete in terms of its actual substance. It is concrete because it not only reveals the causes of the dehumanisation of the human personality in an exploitative society, but also shows real ways of reconstructing society on communist principles, and sketches real outlines of the future of mankind, in which all the sources of social riches—advances in production, technology, science and culture—are used to satisfy the reasonable demands of the harmoniously developed individual and of society as a whole. Marxists, moreover, in spite of the Teilhardist assertion that they are guilty of one-sided “technical humanism” which underestimates the development of the human personality, believe that “a great project—the building of communism—cannot be advanced without the harmonious development of man himself. Communism is inconceivable without a high level of culture, education, a sense of civic duty and inner maturity of people just as it is inconceivable without the appropriate material and technical basis.”¹

Chapter 5

STRUCTURALISM AND HISTORICAL FORECASTING

Structuralism is a very recent phenomenon in the ideological life of a number of capitalist countries, first and foremost, France.² A real “volte-face” was executed in France in the sixties: existentialism, which had dominated for a long time among bourgeois philosophers, retired to the background under the onslaught of a new rival which appeared at first glance to be based on diametrically opposed principles. The turn was a very acute one indeed—instead

¹ *24th Congress of the CPSU, Documents, Moscow, 1971, p. 100.*

² In speaking of structuralism one must distinguish it from what is called the structural or structural systemic approach, which has recently been increasingly developed in many spheres, including dialectical materialism. The difference applies both to methodology and the sphere of application. Far from being confined to the humanitarian sciences, the structural method may be and is being applied literally everywhere. A study of the structural method and the related theory of systems is outside the scope of the present chapter, in which we limit ourselves to structuralism in the form in which it is represented in the West, and primarily in France.

of the freedom and subjectivity, of "that which is experienced" there appeared structure, objectivity and scientific strictness as the main categories. Everything appears to be reversed. Existentialism despised science, considering it incapable of understanding man and his free activity; structuralism not only recognises science but actually sets itself the task of turning the humanities, the sciences about man, into spheres of knowledge as strict as physics or chemistry. But suddenly the "point of contact" has revealed itself: existentialism did not recognise regularity in history and rejected historical forecasting, and so does structuralism.

In a recent structuralist work entitled *Keys to Structuralism*, the author, J.-M. Auzias, criticises Sartre for saying that structuralism is the ideological reaction of a technocratic society. No, he insists, structuralism is not technocratic. For in order to run things the technocrat has to be able to predict, but structuralism cannot predict.¹ Let us leave it to the author to answer for his rejection of the link between structuralism and technocracy and turn to his argument. Structuralism, says Auzias, prefers the study of closed systems to prediction. It studies these systems from the inside and divorces them from the process of creating these systems, from practice and from ideology. The reward is the obtaining of "strictly scientific results".

Here we see the familiar motifs of the idealist world view—the contrasting of "pure and impartial" science with "contaminated" practice and "partial" ideology. The views which have been expressed many times on this subject in Marxist criticism may be justifiably repeated in respect of structuralism. This is not specific to structuralism, however. Another distinction demands attention: the study of systems or structures in a static, unchanging state is contrasted with the study of the process of their emergence and their transition from one to another. "Process and structure," writes J.-M. Auzias, "have an indeterminate relationship with each other,"² which, in his opinion, is analogous to Heisenberg's correlation of indeterminates. "When we understand a structure, we do not understand the process of its formation. When we comprehend the process, we do not comprehend

¹ J.-M. Auzias, *Clefs pour le structuralisme*, Paris, 1967, p. 23.

² Ibid., p. 25.

the structure."¹ For his part, J. Pouillon sees a similar correlation between structure and practice. But the main point here is that the elements of these new "correlations of indeterminates" are by no means equal. Whereas structures in a static state lend themselves to systematisation, formalisation and mathematisation and, consequently, are the subject of strict science, the processes of their formation and practical transformation are removed from the province of strict science. Pouillon suggests resolving the resultant dilemma by the principle of the division of labour: the variable and dynamic to existentialism and the invariable and static to structuralism. It is not impossible that this will guarantee the peaceful coexistence of the two "mutually complementary" idealist world views. At present they are far from solving their differences, however, and in sharp conflict with each other.

However, even if the conflict does end in a peace treaty, this will not mean the solution of the problem. The development of society is a single, integrated process, which cannot be explained partly by existentialism, proceeding from the free activity of the individual, and partly by structuralism proceeding from structures independent of the individual. This is realised by many bourgeois thinkers, and it is not surprising that the discussion on the relation between the structural and the historical approach to society should have assumed such proportions in France and certain other countries.² The attempts of a number of scientists to make wider use of structuralist methodology in order to elevate the social sciences to the level of the precise, natural sciences are unquestionably sincere. But equally unquestionable is the striving of a number of bourgeois ideologists to use the new ideas in the struggle against Marxism, and in particular against the materialist dialectics, against the principle of historicism, against recognition of historical laws and the scientific prediction of the development of society from capitalism to socialism.

The main fields in which structuralist studies are being carried out at the present time in the West are linguistics, ethnology, psychoanalysis, literary criticism and the history

¹ Ibid., p. 24.

² Y. P. Senokosov, "A Discussion on Structuralism in France", *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 6, 1968.

of culture. There are also attempts to give a structuralist explanation of society as a whole, many discursive articles and, more recently, generalising and popularising works.

Some specialists take the view that structuralism is first and foremost a definite philosophy which regards the category of relation as the basis of understanding the world. The structuralists themselves do not agree with this, as a rule, and insist that structuralism should be understood as a method which enables one to obtain strictly scientific results in certain concrete spheres. However, the fact that this method is carried over from one field to another thus becoming widely used demands philosophical analysis.¹

The first of these spheres is linguistics, in which the problem of interest to us was born, that of the structural and the genetic, the synchronic and the diachronic. Even before the formation of structural linguistics in the 1920s, the famous Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure suggested that in the study of language a strict distinction should be made between two perpendicular axes—the diachronic, i.e., the axis of historical development, and the synchronic, i.e., the axis along which language phenomena are connected at a given moment in time. Moreover, whereas comparative-historical linguistics which prevailed in the 19th century concentrated entirely on the facts of the evolution of language, and in particular on reconstructing the Indo-European parent language by means of seeking phenomena in related languages of different ages, de Saussure turned linguistics to face the present day. "It is clear," he wrote, "that the synchronic aspect is more important than the diachronic, because for the talking mass it is the true and only reality."² Of particular importance here was the fact that the emphasis in the synchronic approach was clearly on the systemic nature of language, which had been lost sight of in the historical comparison not of languages as a whole, but only of individual comparable groups of linguistics.

¹ Strictly speaking, it is essential to delimit concrete scientific and philosophical structuralism. This has been done in a brochure by K. N. Gretskey, entitled *French Structuralism* published by Znaniye Publishers, in 1971. The main defect in philosophical structuralism is its erroneous extrapolation of the particular to the general.

² Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, Paris, 1931, p. 128.

tic phenomena. De Saussure deduced from this that only the synchronic aspect of language was systemic, and not the diachronic aspect. It is in this synchronic aspect that language functions as a system of communication, a sign system, which enables people to understand one another. Since language signs are arbitrary, according to de Saussure, that is, they do not have a necessary link with the things which they denote, they must be studied in their mutual synchronic relation with one another; it is this mutual relation in the system which determines the role of each element.

De Saussure's ideas were taken up and developed (and partially corrected) by various trends of linguistic structuralism. Thus, the Prague school of linguistics (N. S. Trubetskoj, R. O. Jakobson and others) developed a new linguistic discipline, by separating phonology from phonetics and systematising the sounds of human speech from the point of view of their distinctive function according to the principle of binary opposition. Subsequently the distinctive units, or phonemes, were subjected to further analysis, on the basis of which a system of 12 binary distinctive features was constructed, enabling the phonetic systems of practically all the languages in the world to be described by various combinations.

Here it is important to note that the phonological system of this or that language is not only smaller than its phonetic system (since not all sound changes have a distinctive meaning), but also more set: in the course of development of a language the concrete sounds may change, but their comparison may perfectly well turn out to relate to the same type and the phonological system will remain unchanged. The phonological system may be the same for two different languages not possessing a single common sound. As can be seen, the system of distinctive features is even more general and abstract. The most important feature of phonological systems is their qualitative-discrete nature. Whereas phonetics studies the minute, gradually growing changes in sounds, phonology breaks up the continuous curve into distinctive units which are contrasted with one another. There are no quantitative gradations in these comparisons: they either exist or do not exist in the given concrete language (i.e., some exist, others do not). This breaking up and con-

trasting is done unconsciously by everyone making use of language, and it enables them to distinguish any words that sound alike (*pen* and *pan*, for example).

But language does not consist only of phonetic and phonological systems. It has a whole hierarchy of systems—sound, grammatical, lexical and stylistic. And in these fields the structuralists of the Prague school and other schools have done a great deal of research directed for the most part towards one basic goal: to determine the way in which different languages use different methods to solve one and the same task—to organise human communication and understanding. These different methods turned out to be not so different after all. By separating their formal aspect and generalising them according to types of interrelations—correlation and opposition—it became possible to determine certain general schemes appearing in different variants. This naturally gave rise to the idea of the deductive approach to linguistic structures and their study by mathematical means.¹

We do not propose to describe here the views of the various exponents of structural linguistics, or to become involved in the heated controversy between the structuralists and traditionalists. We would simply note that the discoveries of structural linguistics are of particular interest for developing cybernetic devices, for machine translation, for improving means of communication, etc. However, it is important for us to have a concept, albeit a general one, of the new ideas produced by linguistic structuralism, because it was from linguistics that structural ideas spread to other fields of knowledge.

In general, one might say that it is not simply understanding language as a connected system (which was clear long ago), but searching in language for certain hidden, more abstract and more general systems by means of turning the attention from the elements of the system to their relations with one another which, in their entirety, also form the structure. The most consistent (from the viewpoint of the structuralists themselves) and the most extreme (from the viewpoint of their opponents) structuralists strive to

¹ For more detail, see: Y. D. Apresyan, *Ideas and Methods of Modern Structural Linguistics*, Moscow, 1966 (in Russian).

present linguistic systems as a collection of "pure relations", in which the elements are determined entirely by relations and do not possess any content of their own (they are simply "bundles of relations"). We would note that, generally speaking, this idea is correct for artificial sign systems, but not for natural language as such, which, as a whole, is a "sign system of a special kind". The identification of language with an artificial sign system (de Saussure, for example, compared language with chess) logically leads to the problem of development being removed from linguistics. The point is that such systems do not develop: they lack inner stimuli for development, and external stimuli are regarded as being outside the framework of their competence. As a result the synchronic aspect of language began to be regarded not as a "momentary cross-section" showing the condition and function of the language at a given stage in its development, but as the revelation of universal, eternal structures making possible communication. Synchronic became identified with static. The members of the Copenhagen school of structuralism led by Louis Hjelmslev tried to present all modern and dead languages as variants of a single structure which does not develop in the course of the development of the language, but is merely reconstructed, regrouped. Some structuralists attempted to base their ideas on behaviourist psychology, others on Rudolf Carnap's studies in logic or Edmund Husserl's phenomenology.

As we can see, structuralism not only stimulated philosophical constructions, but itself, to a certain degree, made use of idealist philosophy. Such a "bilateral relation" naturally puts one on one's guard, but in itself it cannot serve as the basis for a flat rejection of the concrete ideas of structural linguistics. Analogous phenomena were observed, it will be remembered, in the theory of relativity, genetics and cybernetics. In the final analysis the link between the young, developing sciences and idealist philosophy is a temporary one. In the period of impetuous advancing of hypotheses, when firm proof is lacking and the limits of application of this or that theory are blurred, some idealist constructions "turn up at an opportune moment" as the wider, logically based context on which one can rest. But as soon as the concrete-scientific theories can stand on their own feet and show their limits, idealist philosophy is seen to be a super-

fluous "make-weight" and is either discarded or retained for clearly unscientific considerations. This recurs at new stages and in new fields of knowledge.

The same thing is taking place at present in a number of structuralist studies concerning society as a whole or its individual groups by C. Lévi-Strauss, M. Foucault, L. Sébag and others.

Claude Lévi-Strauss is a well-known specialist in the field of ethnology—a science which has roughly the same relation to ethnography as phonology to phonetics (in other countries the terms "social" or "structural anthropology" are used instead of ethnology). Whereas the ethnographer collects, describes and classifies all material relating to the life of primitive tribes and peoples, the ethnologist tries to find inner connections, dependences and structures in them. Inspired by the example of structural linguistics, and phonology in particular, Lévi-Strauss began to search in society for hidden structures differing from the directly given sum of social relations and representing a kind of lingual code. In this way he reduced a vast number of different systems of kinship existing in primitive societies to a few simple types of the exchange of womenfolk. With the help of structural analysis Lévi-Strauss also studied certain other "superstructural", as he put it himself, spheres of life of primitive societies—totemism, rituals, magic and myths. Here also the structuralist principle of the primacy of relations over elements was applied. Thus, in myths the individual images and symbols were not interpreted, but their interrelation, the place occupied by them in the story, was compared, making it possible to discover a whole series of correspondences and to generalise the most diverse myths.

In short, the application to other spheres of certain principles and methods of structural linguistics, more precisely, of the theory of sign systems, semiotics, produced some most interesting results and naturally gave rise to the question: what was the possibility of this application to other spheres based on, what did these different spheres of social life have in common? This common base, replies Lévi-Strauss, is the activity of the human spirit, in relation to which language and culture are "two parallel modalities".¹

¹ Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie structurale*, Paris, 1958, p. 84.

This activity of the spirit is neither free nor conscious, however. It is unconscious, it is certain "structural laws" imposed by the unconscious sphere of the human intellect on the most varying contents. Thus, on a new level there arises something in the nature of Kantianism—"Kantianism without the transcendental subject", as Paul Ricoeur put it.

True, Lévi-Strauss does not want to admit that he is an idealist; he has a great respect for Marx and believes that his "structural dialectic", developed on the level of the superstructure, does not contradict the basic tenets of historical materialism. L. Sébag, however, who is following roughly the same lines, makes a direct contrast between the structuralist interpretation of society and the Marxist one. He rejects the primacy of economics, and ideology as a reflection, and the laws of the dialectic. For him society is a collection of spheres, equal in principle, each of which embodies in its structure some variant of "an intellectual system".¹

This concept of society as a kind of "spherical" whole without beginning or end, without the primary or secondary, is by no means the invention of a few structuralists. It is widespread in modern bourgeois philosophy and sociology. The structuralist method proceeding from linguistics is used in this case to give it "scientific" support.

On the other hand, ethnographical studies are also used for support, particularly those pursued in the USA in so-called cultural anthropology. No matter how empirical the numerous works of American ethnographers are (and, to a large extent, thanks to this empiricism), the general idea of cultural relativism stands out in them very clearly. The various achievements of this or that people, whether they be in the field of technology, art, complex systems of kinship, etc., are regarded as facts of culture, equal in principle, which demonstrate only a difference in direction of interests. Moreover, from this point of view the difference between "civilised" and "primitive" societies is relativised: the more advanced technology of the former, for example, is contrasted with the more advanced systems of kinship of the latter.

¹ Lucien Sébag, *Marxisme et structuralisme*, Paris, 1964, p. 177.

It is interesting that when Lévi-Strauss' views were criticised by French Marxists together with those of American cultural anthropologists, he found it necessary to disassociate himself from his American colleagues, announcing that "static relativism" was indeed a constant danger for the ethnologist.¹ It cannot be denied, however, that he himself to a certain extent encouraged the spread of this danger. Replying to his critics, Lévi-Strauss rightly refers to the need to differentiate between scientific results and their political and ideological use: he wants to be judged by his scientific results and not by the psychological and sociological hypotheses which serve merely as "scaffolding". But it is precisely these broad hypotheses which generally spread outside scientific circles among the general public. The tenor of these hypotheses is such that the "statically relativistic" idea about society is becoming increasingly widespread.

Lévi-Strauss does not deny social progress, but he restricts the sphere of its action to the rapidly developing civilised societies. The transition from primitive stagnation to progress occurred, in his opinion, as the result not of natural, regular development, but of "the luck of the draw" which landed on one of the many variants of primitive society. Lévi-Strauss does not reject history, but, contrasting it to ethnology as the synchronic aspect to the diachronic, he concentrates on searching for universal structures independent of time or, as he says, acting within the framework of "mechanical", reversible time. This means that if these structures somehow transform themselves and vary, the variations cannot be placed in the time sequence in which each successive term arises out of the preceding one. They are simply various combinations of invariable elements in which one and the same invariable scheme manifests itself in different ways.

Lévi-Strauss does emphasise, it is true, that these schemes and structures are not something which exists empirically, not a collection of social relations, but a mathematical model used as a means of study. However, a model works only when it objectively reflects some essential relations of the modelled object. And Lévi-Strauss has good reason

¹ Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie structurale*, p. 367.

to insist on the objectivity of his methods and his science—ethnology. But what does he regard as the guarantee of this objectivity? The fact that ethnology studies the unconscious mechanisms of the intellect which form the structure of social reality. Moreover ethnology which studies peoples who do not possess a written language has an advantage in this: people's consciousness of their actions in these tribes does not distort or rather obscure the functioning of the unconscious structures which act in the modern world too.

We shall now return to the problem of historical prediction. The fundamental difference between ethnology and history (and also sociology), Lévi-Strauss maintains, is that ethnology attains objectivity by abstracting the consciousness factor. History, on the other hand, studies conscious human activity. Consequently, as Lévi-Strauss cautiously expresses himself, historical development "may be unpredictable, since it is never arbitrary".

How one is supposed to understand this impossibility to predict and this non-arbitrariness, has been indicated with the use of modern historical material by another eminent structuralist, Michel Foucault, whose book *Words and Things* provoked a heated debate in the French press.¹ What Foucault was trying to do undoubtedly merits attention in itself, namely, to reveal certain general principles at the base of the most varied spheres of knowledge at a certain stage of social development. Taking the period of European social development from the 16th to the 19th century, Foucault detected in it three alternating unconscious structures or "epistems", which condition not so much this or that solution of scientific problems as the very possibility of posing them, the framework beyond which the people of the given period could not go. These "epistems" are actually sign systems, characterised by this or that correlation between words, ideas and things. But, as we know, systems which are extracted in their pure form can only vary discretely, but not develop from the lower to the higher. And Foucault is merely noting the existence of different systems in different periods, and also the rift between them, which, from his point of view, is inexplicable and even "enigmatic".

¹ Michel Foucault, *Les mots et les choses*, Paris, 1966.

At the ideological level structuralism began to be regarded as a philosophy confirming the dominance of the system, the structure, over man, the priority of that which is stable and unchanging, over that which is current and historical. Structuralism is accused of serving as an apology for the existing situation and of affirming man's weakness. It must be said that such accusations are not groundless, in spite of the fact that the structuralists themselves, for all the inconsistency of their philosophical extrapolations, do not generally belong to the reactionary elements in society. By identifying the historical approach with "unscientific historicism", structuralism as an ideology has given shape and some support to certain attitudes of mind—the fact that part of the French intelligentsia has turned its back on history, which incidentally suits the ruling sections of capitalist society very well.

By using the Marxist dialectic method, one can easily demonstrate the one-sidedness of such an approach.

How does Marxism solve this problem? First of all, it denies the division into "scientific synchronism" and "unscientific diachronism". Marx's great discovery which has become an everlasting part of the treasury of the social sciences is his discovery of the regular, necessary transition from one socio-economic formation to another and, accordingly, the prediction of such a transition. This transition is necessary because of the contradiction rooted in the very process of development, which demands to be resolved. This transition is regular, because the resolution of the contradiction gives a definite direction to the whole process. Hence it follows that the diachronic aspect is no less subject to the jurisdiction of science than the synchronic aspect.

In its transition from one formation to another, the social structure is not reconstructed at random or into one of the possible variants on the same level. It moves to a higher stage of development because, thanks to the resolution of the basic contradiction between productive forces and production relations, and the other contradictions connected with it, new possibilities for development are opened up—not only in the sphere of production, but in all other spheres.

The progressive development of mankind may be traced along many separate lines—the growth of productive forces,

including the abilities of man himself, the interest of the masses in scientific knowledge, the educational level of the population, the evolution of justice and morality, etc. Since they are relatively independent these lines of development each have their own problems, their own contradictions and their own laws. On these grounds Louis Althusser even considers it possible to speak of one's own special time in which each of these lines develop. This idea appears dubious to us, to say the least: the interaction of these lines, if such remains possible, that is, ceases to be necessary in this case and assumes the form of random, chaotic intertwinings. At the same time none of these lines is self-sufficient, none exists by itself, for itself, since it is linked with others by the necessity of fulfilling definite functions as part of the whole. Naturally, the connection between them is not like the connection between the parts of a well-oiled machine. There is lagging behind, bypassing, friction and contradiction. But the concepts themselves only make sense against the background of a fundamental unity: lagging behind or lack of correspondence between two phenomena is possible only in the framework of identical time and necessary connection.

Thus, the social system retains its integrated character not only in the synchronic aspect, but also in the course of development—diachronically. Regular development is inherent in the social system as a whole. This is what Marx and Lenin called the natural historical process of the development of social formations.

But this process is not just a series of qualitative transitions. Each transition is prepared by a quantitative growth. This aspect is entirely ignored by structuralism or, to be more precise, it is excluded by the very principle of structural analysis, which takes account only of the presence or absence of definite relations between the elements of the system. But as a result of this, firstly, the qualitative transition itself becomes incomprehensible, inexplicable, and, secondly, the criterion for comparing the different qualitative states of the system and determining their degree of progressiveness is lost.

From the Marxist point of view, as we see it, even at an extremely abstract level it is possible and necessary to take account not only of qualitative, but also of quanti-

tative changes and their transition to each other. For a change to become possible, a change which is understood as the severance of connections between certain elements and the formation of new connections, the severed connections must first change, stretch and transform themselves from indirect to direct ones.

This is precisely what takes place in the course of the development of capitalism which is undergoing a transition to its highest and final stage, that of state monopoly. The connection between the means of production and the owners, the capitalists, is effected through the agency of banks, the state, managers, and assumes a different character to the extent that the entrepreneurs are letting go of one function after the other and turning into a totally parasitic class. But this connection will not be broken as long as the capitalist owners appropriate surplus value for themselves and direct the development of production in their egoistic interests. The breaking of this connection—the socialist revolution—is a transition from quantitative change to qualitative, a regular and necessary transition because it has been prepared by the whole of preceding development.

From all the foregoing it does not follow that the Marxist solution exhausts all problems and puts an end to further research. Marxism has shown that there are laws in history and, consequently, that historical forecasting is possible. However, the cognition of these laws and of the mechanism of their concrete manifestation is constantly being deepened and enriched by the creative development of Marxist science.

Part III

A CRITIQUE OF MODERN BOURGEOIS SOCIO- POLITICAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE

Chapter 1

THE ANTI-HISTORISM OF THE IDEOLOGY OF INDUSTRIALISM

The ideology of industrialism, which regards the industrial method of production as an absolute, rests to a considerable extent on the specific nature of the bourgeois revolution which, unlike preceding changes of socio-economic formations, means not only the establishment of the rule of a new class and the corresponding type of ownership, but also a radical change in the nature of labour, the way of life of the individual, a change in the type of community within which production takes place.

The industrialisation of capitalist society is organically linked with the introduction of industrial forms of labour which in themselves work profound changes in the social, economic, and cultural order. It destroys the traditional way of life of the individual based on the patriarchal relations, helps to evolve fundamentally new standards of productive activity and life and turns the town into a centre of orienting social and cultural values. All these changes are closely intertwined in the process of socio-economic differentiation which is conditioned by the new production structure of society and reveals a socio-disintegrative, anti-humanist character within the framework of private ownership.

Before capitalist social relations were sufficiently developed, many bourgeois thinkers, even progressive ones, were inclined to link the basic defects of bourgeois society with the new technology of production, i.e., with industri-

alisation. Having equated the bourgeois social revolution with revolution in the means of production, the bourgeois consciousness essentially reduced the essence of the capitalist socio-economic formation to the industrial technology of production. What is more, the institutions and values of bourgeois society began to be regarded as something basically inherent in machine division of labour. This approach gave rise to a peculiar re-orientation of historical consciousness—and the whole history of the development of human society was to a considerable extent shifted to the sphere of the history of production technology, to contrasting the pre-industrial and industrial stages in the development of mankind, i.e., to contrasting “traditional” society and bourgeois society.

This thesis can be clearly demonstrated by reference to the numerous works of bourgeois specialists in the sphere of industrial sociology, in particular to the six-volume study by one of the founders of industrial sociology, the French engineer Frédéric Le Play.¹ Le Play attempted to deduce the disintegrative character of bourgeois society not by analysing the contradictions between the social institutions of the bourgeoisie and industrial production, but from the specific nature of the industrial-urbanised model of society, seen as the direct opposite of the traditional-rural unit. As a result he reached the conclusion that the degradation of the collective spirit in bourgeois society, the isolation of the individual members, the loss of an effective bond between them and various social groups, was explained mainly by the distinctive features of the “industrial community”. Emile Durkheim reached similar conclusions with the aid of identical methodological premises in his works *De la Division du Travail Social* and *Le suicide, étude de sociologie*.

The new level of socio-economic differentiation produced by the industrialisation of production demanded the creation of a new, higher type of social community. Machine industry created the material base for bringing together individuals in associations of unprecedented size. Bourgeois society, however, proved incapable of creating compensa-

¹ F. Le Play, *Les ouvriers européens*, Vols. 1-6, Paris, 1877-1879.

tory social institutions capable of ensuring the inner, organic integration of society.¹

In accordance with the distinctive features of the formation of bourgeois community, which is accompanied by an increase in the authoritarian character of social institutions, the ideology of industrialism presents an apology for the industrial-urbanised model of society, in which bureaucracy acts as the main link in "collectivisation" and is seen as a specific equivalent of the industrial division of labour in the sphere of social relations.

A characteristic feature of industrialism is its complete ignoring of the social contradictions arising from the class division of society, its attempt to formulate principles of a conformist attitude in the individual, based on the "a-social" essence of technocratic precepts. A considerable role in this connection is played by the ideologisation of the phenomenon of "mass comfort", the turning of "mass comfort", a product of industrial-technological civilisation, into a means of incorporating the individual into the pseudo-collective life of bourgeois society.

In the ideological system of industrialisation "mass affluence" is elevated to the level of a metaphysical postulate, called upon to set up the consciousness of a "comfortable existence" against a consciousness of values and culture. In other words, we are dealing with the transference of the meaning of human existence to a purely peripheral sphere of existence. As a "consumer of comfort" the individual is an essential element of "industrial society" with its artificially stimulated dynamic of social production by means of the principles of "fashion" and artificial "obsolescence". This leads to an attempt to change the social role of the individual's requirements which are becoming increasingly manipulated and turning into a means of suppressing the individual by society. The fabrication of requirements, many of which are extremely remote from the true interests of the individual, is becoming an important aspect of the functioning of the "industrial society" and serving

¹ "The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations ... and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous 'cash payment'." (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. I, p. 141.)

to distort the social consciousness and substitute the "consumer" consciousness of a philistine for the class consciousness of the individual. These requirements which are artificially injected into the individual turn into a factor of compulsory integration, increase his dependence on society, and strengthen the power of those who control the resources for satisfying them.

It is quite unimportant whether the given requirements are regarded by the individual as his own or as alien ones. If the worker and his boss obtain pleasure, say, from the same types of social standards of entertainment and prefer the same forms of amusement, this is primarily an indication of the degree to which these requirements serve to preserve the prevailing social structure. Clever manipulation of these imposed requirements and the means of satisfying them distorts the true meaning of social values. According to the theoreticians of industrialism, the possibility of choosing, an act in which the creative nature of the individual reveals itself, is an important aspect of the value of freedom. However, when the individual reproduces as his own requirements those which are alien to him, imposed upon him from without, for the sake of preserving the entire social structure, the act of choice takes the shape of the illusion of choice, the illusion of freedom. Freedom of choice of a variety of goods and services does not mean true freedom, because it serves to intensify social control over the individual and helps to promote the social alienation of the individual. If the individual reproduces in the act of "choice" requirements imposed upon him from without, by the exploiters, as his own requirements, the act of "choice" merely indicates the effectiveness of the control over him.

By offering in exchange for spontaneous existence "industrial comfort" which entails conformist behaviour, industrialism turns the existence of the individual into that of a thing, regarding man as a moment in which (by means of "requirements") the "technological Logos", the absolute of "industrial society", reveals itself. In this aspect "pre-industrial civilisation" with its orientation towards cultural values is contrasted with "industrial civilisation", the civilisation of the "technological Logos" with its tendency towards utilitarian values.

Disraeli's ironical words come to mind here: "...the European talks of progress, because by an ingenious application of some scientific acquirements he has established a society which has mistaken comfort for civilisation."¹ From now on "comfort", to the extent that it turns into a "mass product", becomes an important element in the formation of the bourgeois psychology, turning into a kind of prism of the new "historical" vision. Here, in the field of the acquisition of "comfort", acute social collisions are to find appeasement, labour and capital are to conclude a "contract" because the preservation of the socio-political structure of society is proclaimed as a basis for the "technological integrity" of production.

Orientated towards the "technological community", industrialism turns to bureaucratic administration as the supreme institution of "collectivisation" and examines the social integration of individuals on the basis of the bureaucratic principle of functional-impersonal relations as the expression of the "rationalisation" of social relations. As a result the process of social transformation is reduced to the institutionalisation of certain formal-rational standards of behaviour of individuals, dictated by the "interests" of production technology. This view was given theoretical substantiation in Max Weber's conception of "formal rationality". In his works the ideology of industrialism found its fullest conceptual expression. Essentially "formal rationality" (or "formal rationalisation") is the transference of the principle of "profit estimate" to the sphere of social relations, the turning of the structure of relations of capitalist business into an absolute principle (on the scale of society).

"Formal rationalisation" became an important theoretical postulate for the philosophico-historical aspect of the ideology of industrialism, and was developed in the so-called concept of social modernisation. This conception regards the progression of society within the framework of the "traditional industrial" society as a process of social modernisation. It reduces historical development to a peculiar splashes of "reason" by thrusting peoples out of the centuries of backwardness of "traditional society" into the industrial "modern age" which marks the beginning of the period of

¹ Quoted from John N. Figgis, *Civilisation at the Cross Roads*, New York-London, 1913, p. 17.

"supra-historical" existence. In the final analysis history is represented as a process of the "self-liberation" of mankind from the "limited" past and its entrance into the "universal" modern age. The latter appears in the form of industrial-urbanised civilisation and is contrasted with the past represented by "popular-rural" traditional culture. As a result the basic social collisions in world social development are transferred to the level of the "developed versus developing countries", "the industrial West versus the agrarian East", "the great town versus the great village".

The bourgeois-apologetic nature of the theory of social modernisation finds its logical culmination in the conception of the "industrial revolution" which liberates mankind from the "mysterious enchantment" of "traditional relations"¹ and introduces it to the rational system of the collaboration of "cheerful robots". The theory of modernisation presents us with the conception of the industrial revolution as the conception of a "single revolution", the initial positions of which are usually formulated as follows: "For no country has had more than one revolution, or at any rate, no country has had two revolutions which can usefully be described as bourgeois and proletarian."² The "single revolution" precedes the supra-historical "industrial" model of society, which *a priori* embraces all possibilities of change and is the only "revolutionary" concession made by the ideology of industrialism to the revolutionary past of the bourgeoisie.

Having exhausted its historicism in the approach to the "past", the ideology of industrialism attempts to give theoretical substantiation to the supra-historical nature of "modern" society, in which the idea of the "industrial-urban community"—the "rationalised" community of individuals corresponding to the demands of the "technical Logos"—is set up against the aspect of class relations. Thus society ceases to be an "aim-in-itself" and becomes merely a means of realising abstract rationalisation.

¹ "Much of the magic and mystery that used to pervade human life and lend it enchantment has disappeared from the modern world. This is to a large extent the price for rationalisation." (Peter M. Blau, *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*, New York, 1961, pp. 14-15.)

² Michael Walzer, "The Only Revolution", *Dissent*, Vol. XI, No. 4, 1964, p. 434.

From the standpoint of this "rationalisation" the bourgeois consciousness attempts to depict the process of the all-embracing unification of the activity of the "industrial society" as the main trend in the development of the modern age, as a trend aimed at overcoming existing social heterogeneity, ideological and political differences, since the latter are liable to become a source of dangerous tension and threaten the source of "universal prosperity"—"social integrity". The institutional expression of this "integrity" is generally held to be the state, which is proclaimed as the most important condition for "social" well-being and safety. Any attack on the intensifying authoritarianism of modern state monopoly power against this background is seen as a "criminal" encroachment upon social "integrity", the vital basis of the people's, the nation's, existence.

From being an instrument of class rule, the rule of the "part over the whole", the state turns into the instrument of the "industrial imperative", the "rationalisation", "harmonisation" of reality in the interests of the "whole".

As a result the ideology of industrialism attempts to depict ownership in the "industrial society" as being symbolic, by arguing that it has ceased to constitute the "right" of the strong and testifies to the high material possibilities of the technology of modern production. "We are living in what is probably the first period in history when people are rich, not because of power, but because of labour productivity."¹

Having lost its socio-constitutive nature within the framework of industrialism, the form of ownership and the social collisions related to it cease to be regarded as a vital element in social evolution, as the economic basis of the legitimisation of power. "...Ownership today is not socially constitutive. The form in which property is owned does no longer decide who wields the power."²

The theoreticians of the "industrial society" shift the main accent of power onto the control which, in a situation where social and political institutions are becoming increasingly bureaucratic, creates the illusion of the self-sufficiency of the function of management. "All that matters is control,

¹ Raymond Aron, *La lutte de classes*, Paris, 1964, p. 349.

² Peter F. Drucker, *The Future of Industrial Man*, New York, 1965, p. 73.

which today is divorced from and independent of property rights.... For the future this means that the basic political issues will center on control and not, as in the past, on property."¹

This false division of control and ownership lies at the basis of the distinction between society in the form of a "homogeneous" mass of individuals and the rational function of management which, having "lost" its class implication, becomes the supreme expression of the process of the "rationalisation of industrial society".

Faced with the pseudo-alternative of chaos or collapse, "abstract rationalisation" demands recognition of the unconditional value of the existing order of things and rejects any attempt to find a new system of historical measurement which goes beyond the limits of the "rationality" in question. This rationality is expressed in the curious principle of "economy", from which standpoint the historical alternative to existing reality is seen as something irrational, uneconomic, and the process of social transformation is reduced to a purely quantitative aspect and subordinated to the task of the permanent reproduction of the features of one and the same social structure—capitalism. Using the principle of "economy", the ideology of industrialism strives to give a unitarian interpretation of the diverse phenomena of socio-economic and cultural reality, to subordinate them to the expression of the trend towards "universal rationalisation" which, in the final analysis, appears as a means of masking the interests of the ruling class.

Having refused to recognise the future as something different from the existing social order, the ideology of industrialism tries to drive the past out of the bourgeois consciousness, to distort historical memory which could become a source of dangerous analogy for the "industrial society" that lays claim to "universal modernity", to "universal" removal of social contradictions. In this connection industrialism proceeds from the methodological premises of modern positivist philosophy with its emphasis on "empirical data" and the therapeutic nature of the task of philosophy: philosophy should not concern itself with problems outside the sphere of "direct experience", outside the

¹ Peter F. Drucker, *The Future of Industrial Man*, pp. 73-74.

sphere of the direct "real", but should rid the consciousness of "pseudo-reality" which exceeds the bounds of apprehension through the senses.

For all their striving to "exhaust" the basic social problems of the "industrial society", the ideologists of industrialism are nevertheless compelled to touch upon the future; and it is precisely in this connection that the anti-historicism of the industrial doctrine reveals itself with particular clarity.

It is characteristic that even a writer who claims to have produced the bourgeois "Manifesto", Walt Rostow, confines himself to the following banal statement: "Beyond (the stage of high consumption),¹ it is impossible to predict, except perhaps to observe that Americans, at least, have behaved in the past decade as if diminishing relative marginal utility sets in, after a point, for durable consumers' goods; and they have chosen, at the margin, larger families...."² Having reached the "peak" of material prosperity (the stage of "high consumption"), mankind, according to this type of conception, stopped to think, trying to decide to which sphere it should apply its creative energy. Rostow is quite happy here with the analogy between the process of social development and the evolution of the Buddenbrooks, the family in Thomas Mann's novel of the same name. The three generations of Buddenbrooks go through three corresponding stages of evolution: the first sets out to make money; the second, born wealthy, strives for social prestige; the third, which is born with wealth and prestige, cannot find a worthy social sphere to which to apply its energies and devotes itself to the satisfaction of mere whims. According to the theory of the "stages of economic growth", at the stage of the developed "industrial society" mankind, like the third generation of Buddenbrooks, exhausts its interest in the sphere of social progress; having attained "wealth" and "prestige", it withdraws from the arena of historical action and loses the meaning of its social being. Essentially this curious scheme expresses the rejection by history of the "economic man". Being a model of the

¹ The stage of "high consumption" is the highest stage of the "industrial society".—Ed.

² W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth. A Non-Communist Manifesto*, Cambridge, 1969, p. 12.

bourgeois type of personality, the "economic man" exhausts the meaningfulness of his existence as soon as his actions exceed the economically conditioned limits and enter the sphere of actual human motivations. Refusing to enter into any serious discussion of the future of "developed" society, which is examined *a priori* as a social standard of "progress achieved", the ideologists of industrialism are more than ready to predict the fate of other societies which do not come under the definition of a "modern industrial society" and try to impose on them the capitalist mode of development as the only possible path to progress.

In this connection a special position is held by the conception that the historical experience of the bourgeois states is a model for the future "evolution" of the developing countries. To a considerable extent this type of methodological premise lies at the basis of Rostow's theory of the stages of economic growth.¹ Proceeding from the specific features of the formation of capitalist society in the United States and Western Europe, Rostow develops a five-stage scheme of development of "modern society". The first stage (the initial stage of development) is the "traditional society". This is "one whose structure is developed within limited production functions, based on pre-Newtonian science and technology, and on pre-Newtonian attitudes towards the physical world".² The second stage is the "pre-conditions for take-off" (the transitional stage of society) in which "new types of enterprising men come forward—in the private economy, in government, or both—willing to mobilise savings and to take risks in pursuit of profit or modernisation".³ The third stage is "take-off"—"the new class of entrepreneurs expands; and it directs the enlarging flows of investment in the private sector".⁴ The fourth stage—the "drive to maturity": "some sixty years after take-off begins... what may be called maturity is generally attained".⁵ And finally the fifth stage, the "age of high mass-consumption ... a phase

¹ W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth...*, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

from which Americans are beginning to emerge; whose not unequivocal joys Western Europe and Japan are beginning energetically to probe.... It is in this post-maturity stage, for example, that, through the political process, Western societies have chosen to allocate increased resources to social welfare and security. The emergence of the welfare state is one manifestation of a society's moving beyond technical maturity."¹

Having limited social progress by bourgeois "modernity", the ideologists of "modernisation" went into an analysis of their past with the aim of edifying, in the hope that "masses of men in other parts of the world are now re-enacting that past".² All the authors of this theory had to do was wait for the embraces of their "backward fellows".

In recommending bourgeois institutions as the only possible institutions for industrialisation, the conception of modernisation comes up against a serious difficulty presented by the success of the socialist form of industrialisation. The industrial progress of the socialist countries has proved that bourgeois society is only one of the possible forms of industrialisation, that the "imperative of industrialism" does not necessarily have to be realised in the activity of the "entrepreneurial class". The ideologists of industrialism devote considerable attention to the attempt to show that socialist industrial society is "inferior" and try to present it as the "preceding stage" of bourgeois society. Thus, for example, Rostow states: "...but certainly it (communism) can drive a society from take-off to industrial maturity.... But in its essence communism is likely to wither in the age of high mass-consumption."³ Reserving for bourgeois society the monopoly of completing the construction of the "industrial society", Rostow turns capitalism not only into a "model of the future" of the developing countries, but also into a "model of the future" to which the socialist countries will "inevitably" come, following the behest of the "imperative of industrialism".

The idea of the "transformation" of socialism into capitalism is also developed in T. Parsons' theory of "evolution-

¹ W. W. Rostow, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

² Michael Walzer, *The Only Revolution*, pp. 433-34.

³ W. W. Rostow, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

ary universals".¹ In spite of his attempt to sketch a multi-staged scheme of social evolution, Parsons does not in fact go beyond the ideological bounds of the dichotomy of industrialism, in accordance with which the "industrial modernity" of bourgeois society is the meaning and aim of the process of historical ascent. To a certain extent Parsons' evolutionary scheme is a variation of Weber's idea of formal rationalisation, in which the "evolutionary universals" are stages in the realisation of "Western intellect" which has found "adequate embodiment" in bourgeois social institutions. The ideological creed of the "evolutionary universals" is seen most clearly in the evaluation of the prospects for the "future" of the socialist mode of social development. Parsons is most categorical on this point: socialism is not a special "universal" and therefore the future of the socialist countries will be one of the following: either they will show the "instability" of their organisation (i.e., simply collapse) or they will "undergo a transformation" in the direction of the bourgeois structure of society.

The conception of "evolutionary universals" is the introduction of bourgeois consciousness into the sphere of history—an attempt to adapt social development to the logic of modern bourgeois reality. Moreover, it is easy to see that the principle of "effective adaptation", which is taken as the decisive factor in historical development, is very close to the pragmatic premises of the bourgeois consciousness, to the ideology of adapting bourgeois activity to the scientific and technological revolution.

Alongside the concept of the "transformation of socialism" the ideology of industrialism also developed the theory of "convergence", according to which socialism and capitalism are simply variations of the same kind of society. Thus, Galbraith writes: "Such reflection on the future would also emphasise the convergent tendencies of industrial societies, however different their popular or ideological billing; the convergence being to a roughly similar design for organisation and planning.... Convergence begins with modern large-scale production, with heavy requirements of

¹ T. Parsons, "Evolutionary Universals in Society", *American Sociological Review*, 1964, Vol. 29, No. 3.

capital, sophisticated technology and, as a prime consequence, elaborate organisation.”¹

This thesis serves as the basic methodological premise for the ideologists of industrialism in “designing” a model of the future unitarian society, which is regarded either as a society of “democratic socialism”² (on the grounds of joining the mechanism of the capitalist market with that of socialist planning) or as a “post-industrial society”.³ In such a society the principles of “rational management” find their most adequate institutional expression: the businessman and the administrator are replaced as central figures by the mathematician and sociologist, and the sectarian-minded ideologist is ousted by the “general integrator” who ensures the overall intellectual unity of the various social groups.

In conditioning social developments exclusively by the specific features of the industrial mode of production, the ideologists of industrialism are actually preaching industrial determinism, predicting the inevitable development of a society of the unitarian type. In such a case all that is left for the sociologist to do is to record the “harmonisation” of reality which is an expression of the “universal essence” of the machine. This is why not only Marxist sociology is declared to be obsolete, but also the sociology of such bourgeois thinkers as Auguste Comte and Alexis de Tocqueville. The dialectic of social differentiation and social conflicts is challenged by sociology as the science of the development of “universal affluence”, the science of “social harmony”: “For Tocqueville the prime factor was effacing social distinctions, for Marx the conflict between the proletariat and the entrepreneurs. But I am inclined to think that, for us, the prime factor, which we find just as much in industrial societies of the Soviet type as in the so-called Western industrial societies, is the growth of productivity or the increase in the value produced by the whole of the collective and by each individual within the

¹ John K. Galbraith, *The New Industrial State*, Boston, 1967, p. 389.

² Maurice Duverger, *Introduction à la politique*, Paris, 1964.

³ Daniel Bell, “The Post-Industrial Society: A Speculative View”, *Scientific Progress and Human Values*, New York, 1967, p. 154.

latter,"¹ writes Raymond Aron, one of the most well-known exponents of industrialism. In a stream of abstractly interpreted categories such as "universal affluence", "high productivity" and "industrial production" the ideologists of industrialism try to dissolve the social features of various types of industrially developed societies.

In close connection with the given principle Aron, for example, defines his methodology as follows: "...to avoid opposing socialism and capitalism and to see socialism and capitalism as two modalities of the same genre, the industrial society."² It goes without saying that it is possible to avoid opposing fundamentally different social systems only thanks to the extreme degree of abstraction in which the specific features which give concrete historical meaning to productive activity are reduced to nothing. The authors of "convergence" analyse "the industrial society as such", in which production is turned into a self-sufficient abstract characterised by the following features: a) the shift of labour from agriculture to industry; b) intensive urbanisation based on expanding industrial production; and c) an increase in gross production and the growth of production per head of the population. As the "ideal type", the "industrial society", constructed on the level of the phenomenological similarity between fundamentally differing social models, ignores the differences resulting from the fundamental principles of social development. As a result the "convergence" which is postulated on the basis of the "industrial society" is not the product of historical development, but first and foremost an extremely abstract, speculative scheme.

The theory of "pluralistic industrialism" is a type of "watered-down convergence" which recognises a certain variety of types of "industrial society",³ while emphasising at the same time that the differences between them lose their social nature in the process of evolution.

Thus, according to the ideologists of the single industrial society, the world is in the grip of an irresistible historical

¹ Raymond Aron, *Dix-huit leçons sur la société industrielle*, Paris, 1962, p. 48.

² *Ibid.*, p. 50.

³ Clark Kerr, John T. Dunlop, Frederick H. Harbison and Charles A. Myers, *Industrialism and Industrial Man*, London, 1962, p. 266.

force—"industrialism". The development of peoples and societies has assumed a "visible" trend. Instead of being an indefinite transcendence the future has become reality measurable in tons of steel, numbers of cars and yards of fabric.

This idea of "visible reality", which developed out of industrialism and is interpreted in relation to the consumer society, has become very popular with forecasters. By making this model of study an absolute and turning it into the only scientific blueprint for the future, the ideologists of industrialism have essentially rejected the definitive parameter for measuring the future—the historical one. A clear illustration of this is the work *The Year 2000*¹ which examines the coming period of historical development as the filming of a script with the government as producer and director. The specific nature of historical development is replaced by that of technological change. The book quotes many impressive figures and discusses "various scenarios for war and peace", but, as Erich Fromm has pointed out, in this grandiose description of the future the main thing is left out of account—the "human dimension".²

Turning the laws linked with the development of industrial production into an absolute, the ideologists of industrialism generally examine social development exclusively in terms of adaptation, of the passive adjustment of social institutions and values to the "supra-social" and "universal" demands of the "industrial imperative". This type of hypertrophic approach to industry ignores the most important aspect of material-technological development, the analysis of which is an essential prerequisite for predicting the future: we are referring to the study of the forms, ways and nature of material-technological progress. In itself this progress is far from being identical with social progress; the solution of problems connected with industrial development is only a prerequisite for the solution of social problems, not the solution itself. Orientated towards the selfish interests of the ruling social groups, material-techno-

¹ *The Year 2000. A Framework for Speculation of the Next Thirty-Three Years*, Ed. by H. Kahn and A. Wiener, New York-London, 1968.

² Erich Fromm, *The Revolution of Hope. Toward a Humanised Technology*, New York, 1968, p. 43.

logical progress can become a source of great danger for the destiny of mankind as a whole. When it is not linked with true social progress, material-technological progress merely widens the gulf between man's technical possibilities and the social conditions of his existence, between the dynamic nature of changes in the sphere of material reality and the conservatism of social aims. The more material-technical progress transcends the bounds of bourgeois socialisation, the more one hears bourgeois thinkers warning about the dangers of blind submission of "social development" to the demands of the "industrial imperative". In this connection the following remark by the American sociologist I. Horowitz is of interest: "It may be that continued development is essentially incompatible with social stability."¹ The author sees a way out of this, however, in placing "sharp limits on industrial productivity and technological expansion in hopes of maintaining social order".²

With regard to predicting the future, the problem of the place of the machine in the system of human relationships, the system of social values, is becoming increasingly pressing. The ideologists of industrialism naively assume that the path to human freedom lies in the total enslavement of man by the machine, by industrial production technology. "The new slavery and the new freedom go hand in hand,"³ state the authors of industrialism's "Manifesto".

In fact, of course, the future of human society is certainly not in the "hands" of machines, the use of which depends entirely on the social conditions of the scientific and technological revolution. Social progress, understood primarily as the progress of the institution of social relations, is able to direct technological development along truly humanistic lines. This has been proved by modern development which, on the one hand, shows the full inconsistency of the ideology of industrialism and, on the other, reveals its social and epistemological roots.

¹ Irving Louis Horowitz, "Sociological and Ideological Conceptions of Industrial Development", *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 23, No. 4, 1964, p. 372.

² Ibid.

³ Clark Kerr, John T. Dunlop, Frederick H. Harbison and Charles A. Myers, op. cit., p. 295.

Chapter 2

THE CAPITALIST APOLOGY UNDER THE GUISE OF THE "SINGLE INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY"

(A Critique of the Views of the French Sociologist Raymond
Aron on the Society of the Future)

The conception advanced by Raymond Aron, professor at the Sorbonne, may be regarded as a variation of the ideology of industrialism. By substituting technological analysis of the objective process of the development of human society for socio-economic analysis, he attempts to present two diametrically opposed socio-economic systems (socialism and capitalism) as two variations of a single "industrial society".

On the basis of external indications (the appearance of large production units in the developed socialist and capitalist countries, the industrialisation of labour in various branches of the national economy, such as agriculture, commerce, building, etc., the introduction of scientific and technological advances in the production process, etc.), Aron deduces the economic similarity of the two diametrically opposed systems. By comparing the methods of economic management of the two systems (centralised planning and the market mechanism) he concludes that they promote the development of productive forces in equal measure. This device and a number of other ones are used by Aron to conceal the superiority of the socialist system in relation to the capitalist one. He strives to ascribe the progressive features inherent in the new system to the old, obsolescent capitalist system in order to instil into the "minds of millions" that the class struggle of the proletariat and the socialist revolution are losing all meaning, in order to depreciate the socialist system and its magnetic force.

Proceeding from the thesis that the socialist and capitalist systems are variations of a single social order, a single industrial society, Aron attempts to define the paths and stages of progression towards the society of the future, which he calls the modern, or industrial, society.

Unlike Rostow's theory of the "stages of economic growth", Aron considers it essential to distinguish (in general outline) between the initial phase of industrial society and its mature phase, and only then recommends looking for types

of pre-modern situations and types of the models or strategies of growth.¹

Aron makes use of the method of opposing bourgeois conceptions to Marxist-Leninist ideas. Like other bourgeois ideologists, he is unquestionably disturbed by the authority of Marxist-Leninist teaching. "Why," he asks, "has the Marxist scheme remained so popular throughout the world?"² Consequently he concerns himself not so much with studying the real forms of advance and stages of development towards the society of the future, as with falsifying Marxist methodology and discrediting the socialist system, on the one hand, and defending the capitalist system, on the other.

In so doing he challenges Marxist-Leninist science with his own theory of social development in which he attempts to prove that the two systems, socialism and capitalism, have the same process of development.³

In his attempt to present the ways and forms of advance (development) to the society of the future (modern, industrial, etc.) Aron examines the evolution of bourgeois society under three main headings: 1) economic, 2) social and 3) political.

Recognising the important role and significance for the process of formation and development of the new social order of such basic questions as property relations and nationalisation of the means of production, and attempting to show that they modify themselves, Aron devotes special attention to economic problems. Here he announces that the status of property within an economic and political regime of the Western type is no longer regarded as decisive even by the Marxist parties.⁴

According to Aron, capitalist evolution consists of gradual liberation from those defects and contradictions which Marx pointed to as the basis for the inevitable revolutionary outburst, and for the proletariat taking over the means of production. Admitting the contradictions and defects of the capitalist order and at the same time upholding the idea of its immutability, Aron fights for the gradual inde-

¹ R. Aron, *Trois essais sur l'âge industriel*, Paris, 1966, p. 50.

² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁴ *Colloques de Rheinfelden par Raymond Aron, George Kennan, Robert Oppenheimer et al.*, Paris, 1960, p. 11.

pendent overcoming by this order of its internal contradictions (without a socialist revolution).

However, the logic of the development of capitalist society excludes such a path and assumes, as the classics of Marxism-Leninism predicted, "the expropriation of the expropriators", the abolition of private capitalist ownership of the means of production and the institution of social ownership. This process, which has been borne out by history, is the objective requirement for the development of productive forces. Therefore Aron's thesis that the status of ownership has lost its significance in modern conditions¹ is theoretically and practically untenable.

Proceeding from the dialectical method of analysing capitalist ownership, Soviet and foreign Marxists maintain that the new forms of capitalist ownership, which are supposed to solve the contradiction between the social nature of production and the private capitalist mode of appropriation, not only do not solve it, but actually reproduce this contradiction at a higher level. As a result the process of undermining and destroying the capitalist system acquires new, wider dimensions. The formation of such forms of capitalist ownership as corporate-capitalist and state-capitalist herald the preparation of the material prerequisites for the abolition of private ownership.

A characteristic feature of monopolistic ownership of the means of production in the period of financial capital is that it permits not only the appropriation of other people's labour (as in the period of pre-monopoly capitalism) but also the disposing of other people's capital.

Aron approaches his deduction about the fate of private ownership of the means of production by evaluating modern phenomena of state-monopoly capitalism. In a number of his works he defends the status of private ownership from various standpoints against the theoretically grounded Marxist-Leninist theses on the inevitability and objective necessity of its abolition.

Private ownership, he asserts, does not hamper economic growth,² does not hold back the development of productive forces. However, as practice shows, the socialisation of a certain part of the financial means and forms of social

¹ Ibid.

² R. Aron, *Dix-huit leçons sur la société industrielle*, p. 301.

activity, i.e., the development of state-monopoly measures for stimulating technical progress, the accumulation of capital by the state, the provision of tax concessions, subsidies and state financing of scientific research,¹ etc., demonstrates that private ownership cannot ensure sufficient development of productive forces and that it really does hamper and hold back their growth. This is evidenced also by the fact that bourgeois states distribute and redistribute a considerable portion of the national income in the interests of the private monopolies and assist the technological progress of private enterprises.

Aron admits that for economic and partly political reasons the European countries will be governed increasingly by mechanisms which are recognised as socialist ones,² that the mechanisms of the functioning and the private control of foreign trade, the socialisation of accumulations, the influence of the state on the volume of investment processes which are called socialist, are being effectively realised in the European countries.³ As is evident, he recognises that the process of socialisation, which manifests itself in adjustment of the mechanisms of state regulation of the reproduction process and in intensification of the social division of labour, etc., will develop in the future.

The progress of socialisation is incompatible with retaining private enterprise, however. Consequently, Aron's deductions that the future belongs to capitalist ownership and the capitalist mode of production, hold no water. The interaction of the forms of state regulation and inter-monopoly regulation of production, accumulations, investments and marketing (with all the contradictions, disparities and lack of coincidence of the two) lead to the transition from private to social (in form) regulation, affecting many aspects of capitalist reproduction. What is more, the functions of regulation are carried out by hundreds of employees, as a result of which they become a process of social labour. Within the capitalist mode of production a contradiction is developing between the social (in form) character of the process of state-monopoly regulation and the economic

¹ At the present time about 90 per cent of American fundamental research is financed from the US state budget.

² R. Aron, *Dix-huit leçons sur la société industrielle*, p. 313.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 312.

realisation in it of the private interest of the owners of the means of production, "between the social character of present-day production and the state-monopoly nature of its regulation. This is not only the growth of the contradiction between capital and labour," notes the Document of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1969, "but also the deepening of the antagonism between the interests of the overwhelming majority of the nation and those of the financial oligarchy."¹

Insofar as the forms of state-monopoly regulation are becoming the universal form of manifesting exploiter relations, the relations between the classes, they are promoting the development of a new form of struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie—the struggle for workers' control at all levels of regulation.

Insofar as production relations take on, alongside existing forms, a new form which is connected with the activity of the apparatus and mechanism of state-monopoly regulation, so the class struggle, the economic struggle of the working class, will increasingly become a political one and will manifest itself in the struggle for workers' control and seizure of all levels of the regulation and management of the economy.

Thus a subjective factor is added to the objective material prerequisites for abolishing private ownership. This makes inevitable the abolition of private ownership and the establishment of social ownership.

The second problem posed by Aron in the economic aspect of the evolution of capitalism is nationalisation of the means of production. This problem, like that of abolishing private capitalist ownership, is declared by him to be politically depreciated.²

The experience of a number of capitalist countries (particularly, Britain and Italy) shows that the financial-monopoly oligarchy is striving with the help of the state to exploit the nationalised enterprises and branches of the economy to the utmost for their own purposes. This explains to

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 19.*

² *Colloques de Rheinfelden...*, p. 11.

a large extent the common nature of private and nationalised enterprises, the inefficiency of the latter, etc.

As regards democratic nationalisation, which is advocated by the Marxist-Leninist parties and for which the proletariat and all working people are struggling, this has not lost and cannot lose its relevance either in theoretical or practical context.

As an objective requirement for the development of productive forces, democratic nationalisation of the means of production is an important advance on the path to socialist revolution and therefore forms an essential part of the economic platform of the Marxist-Leninist Communist and Workers' parties. It has been included in the programmes of the vast majority of Communist and Workers' parties in the developed capitalist countries¹ and is one of the central problems in the class struggle of the proletariat and all working people.

Re-examining and renewing the content of the programmes in the light of changed circumstances, the Communist parties are again inserting this point in their new programmes. This can be seen, for example, from a resolution passed at the Thirtieth and Thirty-Second Congresses of the Communist Party of Great Britain held in November 1967 and November 1971 respectively.²

The present working-class struggle for nationalisation and the right of working people's and workers' organisations to take part in the management of enterprises and the national economy affects the basis of the state system, the foundations of capitalist society.

Evaluating the significance of such forms of revolutionary activity of the working class, the founders of Marxism pointed out that economically they seem to be "insufficient and untenable", but in the course of the movement "outstrip themselves ... and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production".³

The importance of the struggle for nationalisation, as also for the proletariat's right to participate in the performance of enterprises and in the national economy lies, therefore,

¹ See *Policy Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the European Capitalist Countries*, Moscow, 1960 (in Russian).

² See *World Marxist Review* No. 1, 1968 and No. 3, 1972.

³ Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 126.

not only in the fact that it strikes a blow at private ownership and capital, but also in that it presupposes a profound revolutionary and democratic transformation of the economic life of the country. These measures and their importance for the progressive development of human society were qualified by Lenin as a gigantic economic upheaval without which other aspects of reorganising the national economy are not possible. He pointed out that unless banks are put under the control of the whole people and unless there is nationalisation and so on, it will be impossible to solve a number of other economic problems.¹

Despite the strikingly expressed revolutionary activity of the proletariat and the whole working people led by the Communist and Workers' parties and heralding a new and higher stage in its development, Aron attempts to persuade his readers that this struggle is incapable of developing further.

With regard to economic development, he mentions a number of other problems which, according to him, are modified or "ideologically depreciated" by the evolution of capitalism, such as economic crises, anarchy of production, income distribution, etc. Crises, maintains Aron, are no longer regarded as "natural, inevitable phenomena". Liberation from economic fatalism (now an integral part of political consciousness in the West) is guaranteed by the intervention of the state in order to mitigate the effect of business fluctuations.²

Evidently the bourgeois sociologist is incapable of understanding the profound processes of economic development of capitalist society. Karl Marx in his *Theories of Surplus-Value* writes: "...the crisis is nothing but the forcible assertion of the unity of phases of the production process which have become independent of each other."³ The classics of Marxism-Leninism proved that capitalist production develops by disrupting the unity of the phases of its process (crisis, depression, recovery, boom, which form the capitalist cycle) and that the progress of the capitalist method of production through successively linked phases is its regular

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 195.

² *Colloques de Rheinfelden...*, p. 14.

³ K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part II, Moscow, 1968, p. 509.

process. Therefore crisis, which is one of the essential phases of the capitalist cycle, is bound to be a phenomenon inherent in capitalism and inevitable for it. After the Second World War state-monopoly capital modified the form of progression of economic cycles and crises, but it is not capable of eliminating the cyclical nature of the development of production for there remain (a) the general cause of crises—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private, capitalist form of appropriation, (b) the ultimate cause of economic crises—the poverty and limited consumption of the working masses, (c) the direct cause of economic crises—the relative over-accumulation of capital.

To some degree crises embrace all forms of capital: money, commodity and productive capital. Whereas the overproduction of commodity capital was characteristic of the period of pre-monopoly capitalism and of the initial period of the monopolistic phase up to the crisis of 1929-33, the over-accumulation of productive capital in the form of underused production capacities is typical of state-monopoly capitalism of the post-war period. For example, in the USA the degree of underproduction of commodities due to underuse of production capacities in the second half of the fifties was equal to and even exceeded the degree of overproduction and the drop in production of goods during the 1929-33 crisis.¹ By changing the form of progression of cycles and crises state-monopoly capitalism is not able to abolish them. "Even the most developed capitalist states are not free from grave economic upheavals. The USA, for instance, has been floundering in one of its economic crises for almost two years now. The last few years have also been marked by a grave crisis in the capitalist monetary and financial system",² said the Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. State intervention in the national economy, produced by a definite level of development of productive forces, does not and cannot change the nature of the capitalist mode of production, nor can attempts to combine new management methods inherent in the socialist system with

¹ See Karl Marx's *"Capital" and the Problems of Modern Capitalism*, Moscow, 1968, p. 325.

² 24th Congress of the CPSU, 1971, p. 20.

old ones belonging to the capitalist system overcome the anarchy of capitalist production.

According to Aron, it is possible to eliminate the anarchy of production by combining regulation and market mechanism. All methods of regulation are imperfect, he says, and universal planning is just as imperfect as private planning or market mechanism.¹

Income distribution, Aron tells us, will be modified in the direction of reducing inequality in distribution. To his mind, the problem of distribution acquires a totally different meaning in a growing capitalist economy from what it had throughout the centuries: "the distribution of income tends to be less unequal to the extent to which the riches of the community increase."²

He deduces this tendency not from figures but from abstract discussion of the fact that talks are taking place between representatives of social groups about the distribution of incomes, that, as he maintains, the "combination" of a capitalist economy and "a representative regime gives growing influence to the elected representatives of the popular masses", that by various methods, particularly the system of direct taxation, the governments may redistribute incomes to the benefit of the "unprivileged" and change the distribution which has resulted from market mechanism.³ In fact, the regulation of incomes by bourgeois governments does not go any further than controlling wages, the wage-freeze policy. The extensive strikes against the policy of wage freezing show that income distribution in the capitalist society is not so much a topic of debate, as a question of the workers' class struggle. For example, three million workers went on strike in Britain in May 1968 almost simultaneously and production at factories all over the country stopped in connection with the publication of the Prices and Incomes Bill. The Bill was to put a freeze on wage increases and provided for the right to take legal action against trade unions (fines and even imprisonment) which carried on the class struggle for a better standard of living. According to official statistics, the number of strike man-

¹ *Colloques de Rheinfelden...*, p. 13.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 13, 15.

days rose from 6.8 million in 1969 to 10.9 million in 1970 and to 13.6 million in 1971.¹ The seven-week strike of 280,000 miners in January and February 1972 was a striking example of the British workers resolve to defend their rights and interests. Clashing with these real facts we have the following statement by Aron: "Some of the values which are called socialist have been realised in Western societies. Income inequality has been reduced, workers' trade unions are relatively free, and discussions on labour conditions have become the rule...", in other words, "a certain number of socialist demands of fifty years ago have today become reality for decent capitalism".²

Nor does the bourgeois state's taxation policy help to reduce inequality in incomes. By their taxation legislation the bourgeois governments do more to profit the large monopolies, managers and senior civil servants, than to give tax relief to the masses. The 1953 tax reform in the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, reduced taxation for persons with an income of 100,000 D.M. and over by 20,000 D.M., whereas the "saving" for persons with an income of 8,000 D.M. was only 40.5 D.M. a year. The 1954 reform gave the second group of taxpayers (mainly workers) another 30 D.M. a year, and the first group 10,000 D.M. Capitalists with an income of over one million D.M. received a benefit of 150,000 D.M. In 1958, capitalists with an income of one million D.M. received a new rebate increasing their real income by another 41,000 D.M. The decision of the West German government to put another 10 per cent on income tax and corporation tax has primarily hit the working people. From the total of 2,250 million D.M. yielded in 1970 by this increase, 1,200 million D.M., more than half, came from wage-earners.³

Changes in the social structure of capitalist society under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution do not tend to diminish inequality in incomes either. The use of computer technology makes the labour conditions of office workers similar to those of industrial workers and their wages to those of highly skilled workers, which points

¹ *The Times*, London, January 31, 1972.

² R. Aron, *Dix-huit leçons sur la société industrielle*, p. 313.

³ See *World Economy and International Relations*, No. 11, 1967, p. 129, No. 5, 1971, p. 86 (in Russian).

to an increasing shift in the economic position of office workers, bringing them closer to the working class.

Thus, an analysis of the economic arguments put forward by Aron in his works shows that the progression of capitalist society to the society of the future through modification of the role and importance of private ownership of the means of production, through the abolition of crises and production anarchy, the overcoming by capitalism of its internal contradictions, etc., does not fit the facts.

In his description of the political evolution of capitalism, Aron also proceeds from the main, apologetic thesis of his conception. He attempts to prove that all the manifestations of the political system in relation to economics in the advanced capitalist countries develop along the paths similar to socialist paths.

He sees these forms of progression primarily in the state acquiring new functions. Regarding them not as the result of state-monopoly capitalism, but as a manifestation of progress towards a single industrial society, he states the following: the state intervenes in the economy in order to maintain the general balance, to prevent inflation and depression; it aims at increasing the amount of investment in the national income; it bestows privileges on certain branches which are particularly important; it improves income distribution, etc.¹

The measures, listed by Aron and others, taken by the bourgeois state (with the aim of mitigating crises, attaining higher production growth rates, establishing a rational structure for the capitalist economy, etc.) are of a makeshift character. They are aimed no further than dealing with the most pressing tasks. Therefore, bourgeois economists, including Aron, cannot, by basing themselves on these measures, make recommendations as to the future paths and forms of the progression of capitalist society towards the society of the future. In a number of developed capitalist countries one finds short-term and long-term state intervention in the economy. It is limited, however, firstly, by private, capitalist enterprise, the interests of which are defended by the state, secondly, by the size of the state's basic productive capacities and credit and finance resources, and thirdly, by the extent of the contra-

¹ R. Aron, *Trois essais sur l'âge industriel*, pp. 151-52.

dictions between general monopoly interests and the interests of individual monopolies. Therefore, long-term state intervention cannot become the overall form of progression for all parts of production as a whole. Consequently, the form of organisation, progression and development of social production cannot be identical for the capitalist and socialist modes of production.

The law-governed process of a lower socio-economic formation being replaced by a higher one is determined not by individual elements of management (although these are very important), but by a whole complex of factors of which one of the most crucial is the lack of correspondence between the high level of productive forces and obsolescent production relations, between the social character of production and the private, capitalist form of appropriating its results, a lack of correspondence which is embodied in the contradictions between labour and capital, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and which forms the social factors of the socialist revolution.

The elements of management noted by Aron which are inherent in the most different socio-economic systems—in the socialist system (centralised planning) and the capitalist system (market mechanism)—tend towards diametrically opposed directions and make for different systems of production relations and far from identical conditions for the development of productive forces. Whereas the market mechanism and the spontaneous market relations inherent in the capitalist mode of production operate against the requirements of productive forces and create extremely contradictory conditions for their development, centralised planning, which is one of the most characteristic features of the socialist system and corresponds to the social nature of productive forces, creates most favourable conditions for their development. Thus Aron's statement that such elements of management as "centralised planning" and "market mechanism" can become a criterion for the development of productive forces in all societies on the path of industrialisation is scientifically unfounded.

In Aron's works we find a repetition of a method long used by bourgeois ideologists, about which Lenin once said that bourgeois ideology operates with the unscientific abstractions of society in general, and progress in general,

ignoring its concrete historical types. But society, progress and man, treated abstractly, in general, all turn out in fact to be bourgeois society, bourgeois progress and bourgeois man.

This deduction is confirmed to an even greater extent by a resolution passed at the Rheinfelden Conference of 1960 under the chairmanship of Raymond Aron. In one of his works he says that the dialogue of the conference delegates (on convergence) could not end successfully because it revealed differences in sociological methods of the social sciences and the interpretation of history. The conference delegates, he continued, agreed that today private or public ownership, market or planning mechanism, were relative, complementary concepts rather than absolute ones.¹

In an attempt to explain why it was impossible to establish a common view on the development towards the society of the future, Aron announces that it was difficult to reach a categorical conclusion on the convergence or divergence of the two types of society. And the reason why it is difficult to reach this conclusion is, to quote him, the fact that there still remain in Soviet society today many elements which are very different from capitalist society and which do not tend to disappear.

In conclusion the writer himself reveals the essence of his own conception. "All historical forecasting," he says, "should take account of that which is called the plurality of decisions or the possibility of conjunctures and accidents." Therefore, he adds, "we cannot forecast the future".²

This state of disillusion is reflected to an even greater extent in Aron's new book which is actually called *Disillusion With Progress*. He notes that study throws light on the limits of our knowledge as such, that there are no specialists capable of "conceiving" the society of the future, that man has not and cannot become the lord and master of social relations, and that "the future ... cannot be predicted".³

An analysis of Aron's statements shows that the bourgeois

¹ *Colloques de Rheinfelden...*, p. 310.

² R. Aron, *Dix-huit leçons sur la société industrielle*, p. 375.

³ R. Aron, *Les désillusions du progrès*, Paris, 1969, pp. 294, 289, 290.

theory of society's development does not and cannot provide scientifically based forecasts of the paths and forms of progression of capitalist society towards the society of the future.

On the other hand, however, the laws in the development of society revealed by the classics of Marxism-Leninism make it possible to determine not only the condition of society at the given stage, but also the prospects for its development. On the basis of an analysis, for example, of the economic laws of development of capitalist society one can establish not only the basic and specific features of such determining factors as capitalist ownership of the means of production, the nature of production, exchange, distribution, etc., but also the trends in their development.

* * *

An analysis of Aron's works makes it possible to draw certain conclusions about the characteristic features of his conception.

Aron does not think it possible to conceive of two modes of production—the capitalist and the socialist—as successive phases in historical development.¹ Hence his view of the future of human society, his idea that society will not be faced with the choice of capitalism or socialism, that an industrial society of the American or Soviet type is by no means inevitable for the whole of mankind.² “There is nothing to prove that history must consecrate the final victory of the Kremlin or the Capitol,” as he puts it.³ According to Aron's conception, mankind passes from the initial to the mature phase of industrial society, and uniformity of economic management, social relations and political forms is not essential.⁴ In other words, mankind is building the type of social organisation in relation to which capitalism and socialism are simply two variations of the same social type,⁵ two forms of development with their own

¹ *Le développement social*. Symposium dirigé par Raymond Aron et Bert F. Hoselitz, UNESCO, 1965.

² *Colloques de Rheinfelden...*, p. 96.

³ R. Aron, *Trois essais sur l'âge industriel*, p. 65.

⁴ *Le développement social*, p. 96.

⁵ R. Aron, *Trois essais sur l'âge industriel*, p. 23.

"strategies of growth"¹ on the path to this "mature" industrial society.

In an age when it is impossible to deny openly that the socio-economic power of socialism is increasing and that the future of human society belongs to it, Aron is trying to secure a place in the future for the capitalist system of economy as well. Firstly, he tells us, the industrial development of the less developed countries need not necessarily be the socialist type², secondly, in the industrially developed countries "development ... no longer demands social changes of a fundamental order"³ and there is no general cause which would make countries follow the Soviet path of development. In an attempt to refute Marxist conclusions on the inevitable victory of socialism throughout the world, Aron maintains that in the developed capitalist countries there is no longer any need for nationalisation of the means of production and the abolition of private ownership, that the status of private ownership does not hamper the economic growth of countries and that the class struggle is weakening. "It is possible that in the future all industrial societies will resemble each other increasingly," Aron writes, "but it would seem that this universal society will not be compelled to make the radical choice between planning and market, between public and private ownership."⁴ This statement is based on his idea that the status of ownership of the means of production and the advantages of socialist planning have lost their value in modern conditions. He extrapolates these ideas into the future industrial society and concludes that the question of the choice between private and public ownership, between planning and market, will be of no importance.⁵ The aims and methodological devices of Aron and the avowed supporters of the "convergence" of capitalism and socialism are similar in many respects. Like the theoreticians of "convergence" Aron tries to distract public attention from the socio-political contradictions of the capitalist mode of production by developing ideas

¹ Ibid., p. 50.

² Ibid., p. 53.

³ Ibid., p. 63.

⁴ *Le développement social*, p. 99.

⁵ *Colloques de Rheinfelden...*, p. 13.

about the uniform evolution of industrial capitalist and socialist societies.

Moreover, Aron considers that as its economy develops capitalism will remain viable¹ and grow stronger by borrowing a number of features of socialist economic regulation,² that there is no danger of it destroying itself, that "in the absence of these historical catastrophes" (military defeat or another severe depression)³ the initiative for rapprochement should come from the other side⁴—from the socialist system. Only on this condition does the bourgeois sociologist allow of the two systems coming closer together. He confirms this idea by the whole course of his argument in many works relating to the evolutionary processes of the capitalist and socialist systems, although he writes that it is difficult to reach a categorical conclusion on the convergence or divergence of the two types of society.⁵

This statement of the common trends of development is necessary to Aron in order to substantiate his claim that as the capitalist countries become more economically developed the class struggle loses its significance. As a result of the growth of social wealth, he maintains, the following questions cease to be meaningful: private or public ownership; market or planning management. The struggle for nationalisation of the means of production and a socialist mode of development also lose their meaning.

By distorting modern social development, Aron tries to persuade the workers that capitalism is transforming itself. This position puts him in the ranks of a multitude of other apologists for modern capitalism.

His conception, however, although it is close to the standpoint of the theoreticians of convergence in that it recognises the "similarity" of the two systems, nevertheless differs from it most substantially.

As one of the most active apologists for bourgeois democracy, Aron makes a great point of stressing the superiority of capitalism over socialism from the political point of view.

¹ R. Aron, *Dix-huit leçons sur la société industrielle*, p. 255.

² *Ibid.*, p. 312.

³ R. Aron, *Trois essais sur l'âge industriel*, p. 64.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁵ *Colloques de Rheinfelden...*, p. 311.

Unlike a number of supporters of the convergence theory (and in spite of the fact that he proceeds together with them from the thesis of a single technico-economic basis for the industrial society), he sees serious differences between capitalism and socialism from the socio-political aspect. "When it becomes a question of comparing a pluralistic industrial society—a society with democratic institutions and guarantees of personal freedom—with a totalitarian industrial society, it is difficult not to prefer, at least in theory, the former," he writes.¹ Naturally enough, together with many other bourgeois ideologists he places his hopes on the "evolution" of socialism towards a rapprochement with capitalism, but he is considerably more cautious on this point than the convergence theoreticians. "As the Soviet economy grows more complex and more productive," he writes, "the ideological imperatives ... have a tendency to weaken.... But thereafter it is difficult to conclude categorically either that these two types of societies are growing closer together or moving further apart. It is difficult because there still remain in Soviet society today many elements which are very different from our society and which do not tend to disappear."² As we learn later, Aron is referring first and foremost to elements of Western bourgeois democracy which he praises lavishly, particularly, as he himself stresses, the right to form "other political groups".³ The dream of all opponents of the Soviet system about creating a political opposition to socialism and the realistic understanding of the impossibility of this ever materialising have led Aron to the conclusion, pessimistic for him, concerning the future of the Soviet regime, namely, that no change can be expected for the time being.⁴

It is for this reason that in his latest works he ironically dismisses the attempt of J. K. Galbraith to "bring closer" the social systems of the USA and the USSR⁵ and writes quite openly that he considers it "premature and, for a long

¹ *World Technology and Human Destiny*. Ed. by Raymond Aron. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1963, p. 25.

² *Ibid.*, p. 237.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 238.

⁴ R. Aron, *Sociologie des sociétés industrielles. Esquisse d'une théorie des régimes politiques*, Paris, 1964, pp. 204, 215.

⁵ R. Aron, *Les désillusions du progrès*, pp. 306-307.

time, inaccurate to evoke or announce the convergence of the two modes of production".¹

Such is the initial conception and ultimate conclusion of Raymond Aron in his approach to the historical prospects for human society.

Chapter 3

THE THEORY OF CONVERGENCE

The theory of convergence occupies a special place among the fashionable socio-political constructions of modern bourgeois ideology. The concept of "convergence" has become part of the vocabulary of voluminous treatises by eminent members of the Western science and the propaganda apparatus of the monopolies. It is widely used by the sociologists and businessmen, politicians and economists of the "Establishment" in the capitalist world. An examination of the role which the convergence theory plays in the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism is one of the pressing tasks of Marxist-Leninist science in our day.

A scientific analysis of the convergence theory shows its true colours as a form of anti-communism—the main ideological and political weapon of modern imperialism in its struggle against the forces of socialism, peace and democracy. The special value of the convergence theory for imperialism lies in the fact that its anti-communist nature appears in disguised form.

The term "convergence" is borrowed, as we all know, from biology where it means the development of similar essential features in different organisms as a result of their adaptation to similar conditions. The central idea of the convergence theory is that a resemblance, an increasing resemblance, can be seen in the two socio-economic systems of socialism and capitalism, resulting from their development in similar conditions of modern industrial technology and economy, in the present-day scientific and technological revolution. Methodologically, we are dealing, therefore, with a new form of the anti-scientific application of a category

¹ R. Aron, *D'une sainte famille à l'autre*, Paris, 1969, p. 174.

from natural science to social life. This device, which lies at the base of such bourgeois sociological conceptions as the theories of the struggle for survival, natural selection, energetic balance, etc., has long been exposed by Marxist-Leninist criticism.

As far as the convergence theory is concerned, its content, leaving aside for the moment the not inconsiderable differences between the various versions, boils down to the following. Under the impact of the need to adapt to the demands of the scientific and technological revolution of our times, capitalism is ostensibly changing its nature, becoming more like socialism, and socialism, in its turn, is evolving in the direction of capitalism. Thus, both systems are drawing closer to each other, converging on their way to some sort of hybrid system which will be neither capitalism nor socialism, but something in-between and, moreover, the best possible social order.

At first glance it seems surprising that the theory of the growing similarity of two opposite socio-economic systems should have originated and spread at the present time, when mankind is living in a polarisation of world forces, socialism and democracy, on the one hand, and the forces of reaction, imperialism and war, on the other; when the direct contrast between socialism and capitalism in all the main spheres of social life—politics, economics and ideology—is more acute than ever before. However, a concrete analysis of the evolution of bourgeois ideology in the modern age—the age of the collapse of capitalism and the worldwide victory of socialism—leaves no doubt that the emergence of the convergence theory at this particular stage of development in the world revolutionary process is by no means pure coincidence, and that the appearance of this theory in the course of the current ideological struggle of the two systems is the logical result of a progressive change in the alignment of forces in the world arena.

The appearance and spread of the theory of the convergence of socialism and capitalism is in itself a revealing fact. It testifies to the failure of the traditional forms of apology for capitalism, which tirelessly insisted that the bourgeois world was the best of all possible worlds. It also testifies to the fact that in our day many bourgeois ideologists no longer dare to speak out openly and are compelled

to camouflage capitalism. And, finally, it testifies to the fact that today the ideological defenders of monopoly can no longer represent socialism as an unnatural system and are forced to attempt to discredit it by more complex methods. Such is the ideological climate in which the convergence theory emerged.

With regard to the exponents of this theory, their views are by no means identical. We are dealing here with a fairly wide circle of people, beginning with the representatives of imperialist reaction, like Walt Rostow, and ending with liberal professors who are not averse on occasion to flirting with ideals of social progress.

Among the supporters of the convergence theory one finds people of the kind which Lenin called "educated philistines of the West" and those who cherish the illusion that their theory will help to reduce international tension in our troubled world.

But the role of the convergence theory in the current ideological struggle on the world arena is determined not by what its various defenders think about themselves and their standpoint, but by its actual content. And this content leaves no doubt whatsoever as to whom and what the convergence theory serves.

This theory is called upon to give a new ideological basis to attempts to deny the historical necessity of the replacement of capitalism by socialism. The socialist revolution is depicted not as the inevitable consequence of the growth and sharpening of the internal contradictions of capitalist society, and the selfless struggle of many generations of working people led by the working class, but as the result of external influence—war or "the export of revolution".

The theory of the growing similarity between the two opposed social systems is of use to the ruling circles in the bourgeois world if only because it helps to avoid giving an answer to the main question of our time: socialism or capitalism? On the one hand, the supporters of this conception assure us that capitalism is "being transformed" into socialism. On the other, they maintain that socialism does not differ essentially from this allegedly "transformed" capitalism.

Hence the convergence theory appears as a new form of justifying and embellishing capitalism. The assertion of growing similarity between the two systems serves as a means

of obscuring the radical contrast between capitalism and socialism. The two opposing socio-economic systems are regarded as two variations of one and the same social order—a kind of “single industrial society”—which differ from each other only in secondary respects that will increasingly fade into the background with time and eventually disappear completely. This distortion of the facts to prove the growing similarity between capitalism and socialism serves today as one of the main means of manipulating public opinion in the capitalist world.

The spreading of the convergence theory is greatly facilitated by the fact that in the “free world” the sources of information are the monopoly of the ruling circles. The lack of reliable information about what is taking place in the economy of the socialist countries, the vast stream of false information on this subject supplied by mass media, creates a situation in which people who do not belong to the anti-communist camp are occasionally taken in by the convergence theory.

However, the true sources of the theory are obvious: it is the offspring of anti-communist ideology and its aim is to discredit socialism as a social and primarily economic system and Marxism-Leninism as a theory of social development. It is to this end that the whole arsenal of anti-scientific methods produced by the defenders of capitalism is mobilised.

Marxist analysis of the convergence theory is called upon not only to reveal the content of this theory as a new variation of anti-communism, but also to explain its genealogy, its connection with earlier forms of anti-communism. Patently obvious is the link with the theories of the “third path” and “mixed economy” which have been widely disseminated for a number of years. Formerly the argument was: neither capitalism nor socialism, but a “third path”. Now we are offered capitalism and socialism. The connection between these theories is quite obvious.

The advocates of the convergence theory attempt to synthesise a whole series of apologetic constructions aimed at concealing from people's eyes and minds the rule of large capitalist ownership and the presence of profound social antagonisms in bourgeois society. This aim is served by the theories of “diffused ownership”, “the democratisation of

capital", "ownership without power", "the managerial revolution", "managerism", the "deproletarianisation" of the working class, "institutionalism", etc. But whatever labels are stuck on the façade of capitalism, this verbal cosmetics is unable to change its true nature.

At the same time the supporters of the convergence theory try to present the economic reforms in the socialist countries as a transition from a planned economy to "market socialism" which does not exist outside their imagination. In fact, in the socialist countries, improvement in methods of planning and economic management means the strengthening, not the rejection of the planning principle in the economy, and it is to this end that all the measures which go to make up the new system of management are subjected. These naturally include taking account of market demand and fluctuations in demand, and it is most important to note that we are talking here not of some vague "market element" in the socialist economy, but about a market in a planned system, a market in which socialist producers function under the conditions of public ownership and a planned national economy. In the planned economic system of socialism the market operates not as a hostile force antagonistic to the plan, but as an element which assists the improvement of planned management of the national economy and helps the plan to fulfil its functions.

Supporters of the theory of the growing similarity between the two systems refer to the fact that in the capitalist countries production yields profit and satisfies the demands of the consumer, but in socialist countries the aim is not only to satisfy the demand of the population, but also to produce a profit. The real point, however, is that in both cases profit and the satisfaction of demand are playing radically different roles: in a capitalist economy profit is the aim of production and the satisfaction of consumer demand the means of reaching this aim. In a socialist economy, however, the satisfaction of the requirements of society and its members are the basic aim of production, and working at a profit is one of the means of ensuring that this goal is attained.

Although the theory of the growing similarity of two opposed systems has definite ideological roots, identical for all its variations, the versions of this theory differ considerably from one another. Moreover, alongside the bour-

geois scientists and publicists who preach the convergence theory in its integral form, so to say, there is an even larger circle of exponents of anti-communist ideology who propagandise this or that section or feature of the theory.

The authors of the convergence theory vary in the emphasis which they place on its individual aspects, advance different arguments, and occasionally draw dissimilar conclusions from their discourse. Consequently, one might speak not of a convergence theory but of convergence theories. At the same time all the different variants of this conception share certain common features, which makes it possible to examine individual authors who adopt different positions on many ideological and political questions as representatives of what is basically a single trend. We shall try to exemplify this by a number of authors who may be considered more or less representative for the convergence theory as a whole.

The American professor W. S. Buckingham must be regarded as one of the first exponents of the convergence theory. In his book *Theoretical Economic Systems*¹ he advances the idea of the "hybridisation of the two systems". Posing the question of the direction in which the world economy appears to be moving, Buckingham states that two new factors have appeared. Firstly, the non-capitalist systems which have been in existence for a considerable time have proved their economic significance in practice. One can now no longer expect them to collapse. Secondly, the capitalist system has undergone such great changes that serious questions arise as to the character of modern capitalism and the prospects for its development in the future.

On this basis Buckingham calls for the creation of a "single economic system", for which he offers a "theory of economic growth", and for the creation of a "hybrid" system by means of the "rapprochement" of capitalism and socialism. This "hybrid" system is to take from capitalism such things as private ownership of the means of production, profit as the motive force of production, and the market element as the means for distributing commodities and fixing prices. From socialism the author agrees to incorporate into this system the economic equality of all citizens, worker or trade-union

¹ W. S. Buckingham, *Theoretical Economic Systems. A Comparative Analysis*, New York, 1958.

control of production, and the planning principle. What is more, Buckingham frankly admits that the aim of his "theoretical economic system" is to help overthrow Marxism.

The foregoing remarks are extremely interesting in that they enable one to expose the very features of the convergence theory which its adherents do their best to conceal behind a stream of hypocritical phrases. The following admissions by Buckingham are particularly characteristic. Firstly, one should not expect the collapse of the "non-capitalist systems", i.e., the socialist system. Thus, the true source of the theory of the convergence of the two systems is revealed. Secondly, the prospects for the future development of capitalism are not clear. In other words, it is becoming clear that the capitalist system is obsolete and that it needs rejuvenating. Thirdly, the mixed system offered by the convergence theory turns out to be the very same capitalist system, for it retains the latter's features and differences. Moreover, capitalism is only slightly camouflaged with vague phrases about economic equality, production control and planning. It is perfectly obvious that such general phrases do not commit the private capitalist owners, who are carrying on production for the sake of profit, to anything at all. Finally, there is the extremely eloquent admission that the convergence theory is called upon—for the umpteenth time!—to refute Marxism, i.e., serve as the Trojan horse in the struggle against socialist ideology.

Buckingham's version of the convergence theory is significant in that here the true class character of the theory is fairly evident. We find the theory in an even less concealed form in the version belonging to Rostow, who is close to ruling circles in the United States, particularly the Pentagon, and whom even the American press calls a "pathological anti-communist".

In his book *The Stages of Economic Growth. A Non-Communist Manifesto*, which caused a stir in bourgeois intellectual circles, Rostow compresses the whole history of economic development into five "stages of growth" invented by him, ignoring the changes in socio-economic formations and the class struggle which is the real driving force of history.¹ On this basis he maintains that the differences which

¹ See W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth. A Non-Communist Manifesto*, Cambridge, 1969, pp. 4-10.

exist between countries in the modern world are determined not by the antithesis of the two socio-economic systems, but by the fact that the various countries are at different "stages of growth".

It is easy to see that the theory of the "stages of economic growth" is an anti-scientific construction presented in pseudo-scientific wrapping. The scientific appearance is created by taking as the criterion for defining a stage of growth the objective course of development of social production; the anti-scientific nature, however, lies in the fact that the process of development of productive forces is examined in isolation from the development of social production relations and from the class structure of society.

On this "theoretical" basis, which is a fine specimen of the anti-scientific methodology of modern bourgeois political economy, rests the conclusion that when the socialist countries reach the fifth "stage" they will have no alternative but to return to the capitalist path. Thus, the openly anti-socialist, restorative nature of Rostow's theoretical endeavours is disclosed to the full.

Unlike the reactionary Rostow, another American economist, John Galbraith, represents the liberal wing of the bourgeois intelligentsia. In particular, his belonging to US ruling circles did not prevent him from seeing the futility of the American escalation of the war in South-East Asia and from criticising the most blatant features of Washington's policy in that area. But Galbraith, like Rostow and the other exponents of the convergence theory, regards technology and the development of productive forces in isolation from the character and development of production relations.

According to him, capitalism and socialism are merely different forms of the "new industrial society": in the course of its development capitalism is increasingly becoming "capitalism without capitalist intervention" and socialism shows the tendency to turn into "socialism without control by society".

In his work *The New Industrial State* Galbraith maintains that the modern industrially developed countries have outgrown the stage of market economy and that a new, non-market economy is developing. "The increased use of technology and the accompanying commitment of time and

capital," he writes, "were forcing extensive planning on all industrial communities."¹

Galbraith proceeds from the fact that the development of society is determined by technological progress and not what he contemptuously calls "ideological symbols". Modern technological development combined with the growth of monopoly means, according to him, the end of the market economy and the change to a planned economy. He maintains that "...we have an economic system which, whatever its formal ideological billing, is in substantial part a planned economy".²

The planned character of modern capitalist economy is determined, according to him, by the fact that the initiative in the question of what should be produced comes not from the sovereign consumer who dictates his will through the market, but from the corporation which strives to establish control over markets and to influence the consumer in accordance with its calculations and needs. In so doing the corporation exerts a decisive influence on the consumer's scale of values and his convictions.

"One of the conclusions that follows from this analysis is that there is a broad convergence between industrial systems," he writes. "The imperatives of technology and organisation, not the images of ideology, are what determine the shape of economic society."³

Galbraith's position is in many ways similar to that of the many exponents of the "technocratic" version of the convergence theory. The essence of this theory is that technological development has the same tendencies in both the capitalist and the socialist countries. The main tendency, it is maintained, is the growing role of the technocrats. Hence the conclusion that on this basis there is bound to be a convergence of the two socio-economic systems.

The basic flaw in this argument is that the process of technological development is examined in total isolation from this or that social system, from the class structure of society. Yet it is precisely the socio-economic organisation of society that determines the nature and character, the results and consequences of technological progress, the con-

¹ J. K. Galbraith, *The New Industrial State*, Boston, 1967, p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

crete trends, forms and rates of technical development and the organisation of production.

The technocratic version of the convergence theory proceeds from the false premise that with the development of modern technology, in particular in the scientific and technological revolution, there grows up a "hierarchy of specialists" in all societies, both capitalist and socialist. A characteristic feature of specialists under both systems is that they engage in their specialised sphere and become increasingly indifferent to political and ideological problems. In the formation of the new industrial society headed by technocrats, it is maintained, an increasing convergence of socialism and capitalism is inevitably taking place. As a result of this a society is to emerge in which all problems are solved on the basis of a purely professional approach by the technocratic élite.

The specific peculiarity of capitalism—the growing role of technocrats lacking any broad interests—is presented as a universal law which, it is maintained, is also spreading to socialism. Characteristically, the technocratic utopia reflects the desire to avoid the main question with which the modern age confronts all thinking people, namely: capitalism or socialism?

Some theorists and planification experts in capitalist countries propagate the convergence theory, claiming that the purposes of economic policies in the West and East are drawing together and therefore both "economic structures" are advancing towards the "best possible structure".

In doing this they put the accent on the technical devices of drawing up plans and on the use of computer technology in solving economic problems, draw parallels between methods of organising production and regulating the economy in socialist and capitalist countries. Moreover, they stress that both here and there the method of inter-branch balances and linear programming are used. They come to the conclusion that a broader development of planification is essential in the capitalist countries of Western Europe. These discussions, however, overlook the radical, decisive differences between the two socio-economic systems, which determine the completely different role of outwardly similar methods of programming and other analogous organisational and technical instruments.

An example of this type of reasoning is the version of the convergence theory belonging to Professor J. Tinbergen, the well-known Dutch exponent of the econometric school in political economy, who was awarded a Nobel prize in 1966.

In his main work *Economic Policy: Principles and Design*, Tinbergen formulates five main aims suitable, in his opinion, for all social systems existing at the present time. These are, firstly, the maintenance of international peace, secondly, maximum real expenditure per capita with "full" employment and monetary equilibrium, thirdly, improved distribution of real income or expenditure over social groups and countries, fourthly, emancipation of certain underprivileged groups, and fifthly, as much personal freedom as is compatible with the other aims.¹

It is not difficult to see that capitalist society is presented in an idealised form in this definition of its aims. The main aim of capitalist production, namely, the attainment of monopoly high profits is ignored, as is the fact that aims which correspond to the interests of society as a whole (such as a policy of peace, a higher standard of living, etc.) are attainable only as a result of and in step with the successful struggle of the working class against all-powerful monopoly capital.

Tinbergen maintains that to draw a distinction between capitalism and socialism is an old-fashioned way of framing the question. If pure capitalism ever existed, he writes, and in the Western countries it existed to a greater or lesser degree in the 19th century, the modern socio-political system in these countries is very different from it. The difference consists in the following. The power of the owners of capital has been considerably reduced in favour of managerial and workers' organisations. Socialist ideas have filtered into many spheres: social insurance, taxation, state enterprises, and various forms of planification.

The same applies to socialism. In the last few years, according to Tinbergen, the socialist countries have discovered that centralised planning must not exceed a certain limit if it is to be efficient, and that some of the tasks of the planners and administrative bodies must be handed over to lower organisations.

¹ J. Tinbergen, *Economic Policy: Principles and Design*, Amsterdam, 1956, pp. 15-17.

Hence he concludes that from the economic point of view the "best system" is a synthesis of certain elements of "capitalist" efficiency and "socialist" equality. Thus, Tinbergen maintains, the question of the best socio-economic system has grown from an absolutely qualitative comparison into a problem which is only relative and quantitative. It is this "synthesis" of both systems which is to produce what we are to regard as the "best possible structure" of society.

It is characteristic that reactionary Western economists who object to planification also reject Tinbergen's version of the convergence theory. Thus, at the annual meeting of the West German Society for Eastern European Studies held in October 1965 in Oberhausen, Professor K. Thalheim of West Berlin, well-known for his anti-communist views, sharply criticised Tinbergen for his report on the convergence of the two systems. He formulated his objections in five points.

First, nationalisation of the means of production remains in force in the socialist countries and, therefore, there are no grounds for comparing the position of the economic leaders in these countries with the role of capitalist managers. Secondly, the socialist countries have centralised planning and "market-economy" methods are applied only to fulfil plans. Thirdly, prices are fixed by state agencies with the result that they do not play the role of an "indicator of economic shortage" and cannot serve as a reliable basis for taking decisions on capital investment. Fourthly, there can be no question of real competition, for enterprises appear and disappear not as a result of competition. Fifthly, the aims of the economy in socialist countries are determined by political institutions.

Leaving aside the vocabulary used by this reactionary ideologist, one is bound to admit that his objections to the convergence theory are not void of realism.

An analysis of the most characteristic versions of the convergence theory shows that its main flaw lies in a violation of the most important principle of scientific study: it diverts attention from the most essential aspects of the objects under examination. The only scientific theory of social development—the Marxist theory which has stood the greatest test of history—provides a firm basis for understanding the essence and content of the main contradiction

of the modern age, namely, the contradiction between capitalism and socialism.

Marxism examines the development of society as a natural scientific process, generalising the systems in various countries into a basic concept of the socio-economic formation. Marxism also provides an objective criterion which makes it possible to ascertain the nature of this or that particular form of society strictly scientifically. In any social form of production its factors are always the workers and the means of production. These forces invariably combine in some way or other in the process of production. "The specific manner in which this union is accomplished," wrote Marx, "distinguishes the different economic epochs of the structure of society from one another."¹

This scientific fact takes away the ground under the feet of the exponents of the convergence theory, who ignore the decisive fact that the ways of combining workers with the means of production under socialism and capitalism are diametrically opposed. In the socialist system of economy this combination is based on public ownership, whereas under capitalism it is based on private capitalist ownership.

Distorting the facts, the supporters of the convergence theory maintain that the economic reforms in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which provide for a considerable strengthening of centralised planned management of the national economy, mean an approximation to capitalist standards of management. This fabrication is disproved by the fact that socialist economy, both before and after the reforms, is based on public ownership, which always was, is, and always will be the firm basis of the socialist mode of production.

At the same time propagandists of the convergence theory argue that decisive changes have taken place in the capitalist economy, namely, that private ownership has been replaced by some forms of public ownership. They point to the change-over from individual enterprises to joint-stock companies, to the growth of state property, to the increased role of such forms of accumulation of capital as insurance firms, pension funds, etc., and, finally, to the expanding ownership of shares which is depicted as a "diffusion" of

¹ K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1971, pp. 36-37.

ownership. An evolution in the concrete forms of capitalist ownership is taking place, and Marxist science has not the slightest inclination to deny it. But the point is that the spread of new forms of ownership is taking place within the framework of capitalism, and they are all different forms of capitalist ownership, certainly not of public ownership.

"The capitalist system," wrote Marx, "presupposes the complete separation of the labourers from all ownership of the means by which they can realise their labour."¹ This separation is fully preserved in the joint-stock type of enterprise, and the very insignificant spread of small shares among leading groups of the working people does not alter anything. The separation is also fully preserved in the state enterprises, which like private ones, function on the basis of capitalist production relations and private ownership of the means of production. This is recognised by serious observers, even if they are very far from being Marxists.

Thus we see that capitalism remains capitalism, and socialism remains socialism. Socialism is not becoming less socialist, and capitalism is not becoming less capitalist. Improvement of the economic mechanism of socialism not only does not change its essence, but, on the contrary, increases the efficiency of its economic system and thereby promotes further progress towards the cherished goal of communism. The changes taking place in capitalism are also not capable of transforming its nature. Some of them as, for example, the well-known measures in the sphere of social security, are concessions which have been won in the struggle of the working masses, while others, such as planification, economic programming, nationalisation of some enterprises and branches of industry, are concessions to the modern development of productive forces, which are being increasingly restricted by capitalist private ownership. Both types of changes demonstrate the real possibility of a transition from capitalism to socialism and the urgent objective need for this transition, but in themselves they certainly do not change the nature of the capitalist system.

One fact which emerges particularly clearly during the historical struggle between the two social systems is that

¹ K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1965, p. 714.

these systems—socialism and capitalism—are living and developing in accordance with opposite laws. Whereas the laws of the exploitation of labour by capital prevail in the world capitalist system, the world socialist system is founded on the principles of comradely collaboration and socialist mutual aid by workers who are free from exploitation. Whereas in capitalist system the relations between countries and peoples are based on the principles of dominance—the subjection, oppression and enslavement of weak countries by strong ones—the socialist system unites free peoples enjoying equal rights, possessing a common socio-economic structure, a common progressive ideology and a common high goal.

There can be no doubt about the political essence of the convergence theory. Whatever the subjective beliefs of its individual supporters, its objective role is quite clear: it serves as an ideological weapon for anti-communism, a weapon for the forces of imperialism and reaction in their struggle against progressive mankind, against those who are striving for peace, democracy and socialism.

The convergence theory performs important functions in the global strategy of world imperialism and its vanguard—the ruling circles of the United States. It is called on, firstly, to attract into the anti-communist camp those sections of the Western public, particularly from the intelligentsia, who cannot be enlisted by blatant, militant anti-communism. It is also used as a bait for unstable, vacillating elements in the working-class and communist movement, who are ready to swallow any “new” ideas uncritically. People inclined to be ideologically “omnivorous” begin by urging that Marxism should be renewed and improved by “refurbishing” it with fashionable bourgeois theories and invariably end up by deserting from the camp of the militant proletariat.

The convergence theory is enthusiastically backed up in particular by supporters of the various versions of the so-called “new market model” of socialism, which means rejection of centralised planned management of the socialist economy, replacement of public ownership of the means of production by group ownership of teams of producers, and setting up a “free” market with unrestricted competition, etc.

The convergence theory is used to present in a distorted light processes taking place in both socialist and capitalist

society. It is aimed against the Marxist-Leninist conception of social development—the all-conquering ideological weapon of the working class and all the progressive forces of our time in their struggle for a better future for mankind. Thus objectively it is serving not the cause of progress, but entirely opposite aims.

For the capitalist countries the convergence theory advances an objectively anti-revolutionary prospect for the future. Instead of a programme for the revolutionary, socialist transformation of society, a real programme for the struggle for democracy and socialism, it offers a technocratic alternative based on the false premises that the scientific and technical revolution, and particularly the development of automation and cybernetics, will in itself solve the social problems of modern capitalism. In this connection it denies the historic role of the working class as the main and decisive force in the struggle for socialism, preaches the idea of the “integration” of the proletariat in bourgeois society, and concludes that there is no need for the class organisation of the proletariat, which leads the struggle of this society against the monopolies and the forces of imperialist reaction and war.

For the socialist countries the convergence theory advocates the “dismantling” of Marxist-Leninist ideology which ensures the unity of aim and action of the builders of socialism and communism and cements their solidarity in the struggle against world imperialism. It demands the “de-ideologisation” of politics, which means destroying the main force of the anti-imperialist front, and the “de-politisation” of economics, meaning the rejection of the basic principles of the socialist economic system. It expounds far-reaching programmes for the “dilution of communism” and develops cunning tactics of “gradualism” and “evolution” for putting these anti-popular programmes into action. One need hardly mention that all these calculations ignore the master, namely, the peoples of the socialist countries who are building their future on the paths of socialism and communism under the experienced guidance of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The convergence theory is extensively used by those who plan the foreign policy of imperialist states. The political equivalent of this theory is the policy of “building

bridges between East and West", proclaimed by President Johnson when he was in office. Analogous conceptions can also be found in other imperialist states.

All these conceptions are intended to create the illusion of a "reappraisal of values", the impression of a new line, a departure from the aggressive programmes of "rolling back communism" and "liberating" the countries of Eastern Europe, and so on.

The false trans-Atlantic peacemakers and their West European partners occasionally make no special secret of their true intentions. This became particularly obvious in connection with the events in Czechoslovakia where in 1968, with the connivance of Right-wing opportunist, revisionist elements in the leadership of the Party and the country, counter-revolutionary, reactionary forces reared their heads with the aim of forcing the country out of the socialist community and restoring a capitalist order.

The builders of "bridges" between West and East go as far as to maintain that peace plans are compatible with imperialist aggression in the form of local wars.

"How can one doubt the compatibility of peaceful co-existence and limited wars?" asked a supporter of the theory of the "single industrial society", the French sociologist Raymond Aron, in an article entitled "The World Is Divisible" printed in *Le Figaro* on January 2, 1968.

The successes of socialism in all spheres of public life, the achievements of the socialist countries in economics and culture, science and technology, are a vivid illustration of the superiority of socialist society and of its political and economic systems. The bourgeoisie are striving to get revenge in the ideological sphere by attacking communist ideology. Their main ideological and political weapon is anti-communism, which consists of slandering the socialist system, falsifying Marxism-Leninism and distorting the aims and activities of the Communist parties. All the forces of the old world are gathering under the banner of anti-communism, and it is under this banner that the supporters of the convergence theory also stand.

History has shown the truth of Lenin's words emphasising that "the *only* choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for mankind has not created a 'third' ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class

antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above-class ideology)".¹

The whole of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, its spirit, all the practical experience of the class struggle over the many centuries, the experience of the international working-class movement, the experience of building socialism in the Soviet Union and other socialist states—all this bears out the truth of Lenin's words.

There is not and cannot be any place for neutrality in the fierce ideological struggle of our time. The acceptance of this or that element from the ideology of anti-communism, even if they are presented under the guise of friendship and good-will, is of benefit only to the enemies of peace, democracy and socialism.

Chapter 4

THE UTOPIA OF THE WORLD STATE AND THE PROBLEM OF REGIONALISM

The idea of creating a world state acquired its greatest number of supporters in the 1940s in the United States, when that country was the undisputed leader of the capitalist world and when sole possession of the atomic bomb whetted the global appetites of the American imperialists.

Today the popularity of this idea has decreased considerably, particularly in the United States. American imperialism can no longer lay claim to world supremacy, and therefore its scientists and politicians quite rightly consider it unrealistic to advocate the creation of world-wide associations of states, even remotely reminiscent of a world state.

Nevertheless this idea still has some supporters today, although they are very few in number. It has become the property of the pacifist section of the Western intelligentsia, which sincerely desires peace and considers it essential to take urgent and radical measures to remove the threat of world war. For this reason the idea of the world state appears today mainly as one of the proposals (of a utopian nature) for removing the threat of war. However, since the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 384.

pacifists propose it as the only way to create a world without wars the idea also appears as a prediction for the future evolution of mankind and is thereby set up against the Marxist-Leninist ideas of attaining a peaceful future. Moreover, this idea must not be classed as a totally arbitrary one and therefore not meriting attention, because its supporters try to base their argument on certain real, objective conditions and tendencies in the modern world, such as the existence of the threat of a catastrophic war, the frequent violations of peace in various parts of the globe, the existence of large regional unions, the tendency towards economic rapprochement of nations in the form of extending relations between them, etc. A demonstration of the utopian nature of this idea will show that modern conditions and trends by no means demand the setting up of a world state and that its supporters do not take into account a number of other most important, decisive factors which make it utopian.

**Certain philosophical "arguments" in favour of the idea
of the world state**

The actual content of the idea of the world state is very simple. National states are to give up part of their sovereignty—that part which concerns the maintenance of national security—and hand it over to a world organisation, a world government, which will maintain order in the world with the help of international police forces, large enough to restrain any aggressor. The authority of the world government, which would be initially confined to the tasks of preserving peace and effecting disarmament, might subsequently extend to other spheres and lead to the formation of a world commonwealth of nations.

The theoretical arguments used to support this global plan are somewhat more complex than the idea itself. The most widespread is the blatantly ill-founded argument that national sovereignty is the cause of the arms race and international conflicts (Grenville Clark, Louis B. Sohn, Norman Cousins, and others). The conception of the "single industrial society" is often used as a sociological argument (R. Angell, A. Etzioni, and others). Socio-psychological arguments about the similar psychologies of various nations and attachment to one's own nation engendering a hostile attitude towards other nations have also become fairly widespread (Charles

Osgood, R. White, and others). Let us consider certain philosophical conceptions which are advanced either directly as arguments in favour of the world state, or indirectly in other unphilosophical arguments.

Two basic philosophical conceptions which contradict each other are used openly or covertly by the supporters of the world state (known as the "federalists") and also by many Western politicians and specialists. One of them is based on the rationalist model of man, according to which man is a rational being guided by his knowledge and reason. All the various conflicts in society and in the international arena are the result of gaps in human knowledge, misunderstanding of situations, people and countries. The present governments either do not know the right way to secure a lasting peace, or do not properly understand the advantages of the sensible projects presented to them. From this it follows that a detailed plan for the creation of a world state must be drawn up, the advantages of which would be understood by even the most thick-headed politicians. This is the standpoint of those whose plans for a world state concentrate mainly on producing a blueprint which is acceptable to everyone.¹

The other philosophical conception used by the "federalists" as an argument is based on the irrational model of man, which treats him as an irrational, naturally aggressive creature. According to this conception, the various social ideas, plans and ideologies are nothing more than rational justifications, "rationalisations" of man's deep-seated irrational strivings and urges. Conflicts on all levels are natural and inevitable, and the important thing is to get these conflicts under control. A world government would be this sort of controlling body and would deal with conflicts between nations, preventing them from assuming dangerous proportions. "Clearly, what is needed is nothing less than a single World State, or World Federation of States," declares the neo-Freudian Alex Strachey.²

The irrational model of man has become far more widespread in the West than the rational model, as a result of

¹ An important book in this respect is: Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn, *World Peace Through World Law*, Cambridge, 1967.

² A. Strachey, *The Unconscious Motives of War. A Psychoanalytical Contribution*, London, 1957, p. 221.

the profound influence of psychoanalysis in the Western countries, particularly the United States. It should be borne in mind that the influence of psychoanalysis is not the same as the influence of Freudism, because modern psychoanalysis differs considerably from Freudian psychoanalysis. In the words of Erich Fromm, "many of these new schools, while developing valuable insights, have also lost much of the most important discoveries of Freud".¹ Whereas Freud thought war was "a perfectly natural thing", the psychoanalysts of today by no means regard wars as "natural" and try to find means of preventing them. The idea of a world state is supported both by many psychoanalysts and by proponents of other disciplines who share the irrationalist view of man.

Are these two "philosophies of man" convincing arguments in support of creating a world state? Leaving aside the fact that it is essential for the justification of any large political plan to have far broader knowledge and arguments than merely philosophical ones, and that philosophy alone is most insufficient for understanding concrete political processes, the philosophical conceptions outlined above contradict in themselves—each in its own way—the idea of a world state.

The inconsistency of the irrational model as an argument in favour of a world state lies in the fact that this model asserts the principle of the solution of international conflicts by force, which contradicts the idea of a voluntary and conscious union of peoples in a "World Federation". If nations are irrational and aggressive by their very nature, the act of uniting them in a world "commonwealth" would also be carried out by force, by a state or group of states. However, such an action in present-day conditions is tantamount to total war or "limited" wars.

The rationalist conception of human nature also contains a principle which contradicts the idea of a world government. This principle is the conscious, voluntary agreement of nations to unite, which is possible only if all governments understand the need to unite and accept a detailed plan for putting this idea into practice. However, the idea of the

¹ Erich Fromm, *The Heart of Man. Its Genius for Good and Evil*, New York-Evanston-London, 1964, p. 14.

world state provides for the creation of organs of coercion (police forces, courts, procurator's office) which are designed to deal with violators of order, "unreasonable" national governments. The means of setting the "recalcitrant" governments on the "true path"—the use of international police forces, albeit in extreme cases—contradicts both the original principle of voluntary and conscious union, accepted in the creation of the "World Federation", and the ensuing principle of voluntary membership of the union. For it is highly doubtful that states which joined together in a "World Federation" would not retain the right to withdraw from it. Any serious violation of peace in the global state would, evidently, be accompanied by the secession from it of one or several states, which would render illegal the use of police measures. But even if such measures were taken—contrary to the democratic principles of world union—in the case of peace being violated by large nations it would require many millions of policemen to "settle the dispute", i.e., contingents far in excess of all the existing armed forces.

Thus, whereas the rationalist conception contradicts the idea of setting up coercive organs in a world state, the irrationalist conception contradicts the idea of the conscious and voluntary union of nations. Both conceptions taken together demonstrate the inner contradiction of the idea of the world state. Moreover, they ignore the main objective circumstance which testifies to the impossibility of setting up such a state in modern conditions, namely, the existence of two radically opposed socio-economic systems.

The utopian nature of the idea of the world state

In their arguments on the need to set up a world state the "federalists" often make use of certain phenomena and processes in the modern world which, in their opinion, demand that their plan be put into effect. They cite, for example, the threat of nuclear war, the growth of economic relations, the exhaustion of natural resources, and the exploration of outer space.

In so doing they ignore the fact that the progressive modern trends to which they refer can be developed further, and the negative trends controlled or countered without the transformation which they are proposing. Thus, the

threat of nuclear war could be removed by destroying stock-piles and banning the manufacture of nuclear weapons or, even more effectively, by general and complete disarmament. Economic relations can also be successfully developed on the basis of bilateral agreements, and even in this elementary form of international collaboration a great deal remains to be done. The planned development of natural resources and the exploration of outer space could be successfully implemented on the basis of multilateral agreements or within the framework of the United Nations.

In each of the spheres mentioned by the "federalists" there is a great deal of room for the democratic settlement of problems to the benefit of many countries within the framework of existing international and world agreements, organisations and associations. The "federalists" are proposing that there should be a sudden transition to a world state at a time when even bilateral relations between existing states have not been fully and democratically developed.

As well as ignoring the elementary, secondary and higher transitional stages in the formation of a "World Federation", the "federalists" also underestimate a number of basic phenomena and processes of our time which contradict their utopian idea.

First and foremost, so far not a single state has expressed the wish to relinquish even part of its sovereignty to any world organisation. This is not surprising for, on the one hand, modern capitalism is continuing to evolve primarily in the framework of national states and, on the other, in our age which is characterised by the establishment and successful development of the socialist system, the fully sovereign state has been, is and for the next few decades will continue to be the main form in which truly popular sovereignty is exercised. The path to a final merging of nations in a broad commonwealth is based on two progressive tendencies: the fullest possible development of the national socialist states and a tremendous expansion and strengthening of international relations between sovereign socialist states.

The "federalists" criticism of nationalism is directed mainly against the anti-imperialist nationalism of the young developing states. They frequently overlook the aggressive nationalism of the developed capitalist states, particu-

larly of the United States. Modern American imperialism is not the opposite of bourgeois nationalism, but its direct continuation and expression. As former US Under-Secretary of State, George Ball, admitted: "...we [i.e. the United States—*E. K.*] remain, as we have historically been, a notably nationalistic country. Only in narrowly limited areas have we ever reconciled our nationalism with a willingness to submit to the arbitrament of international institutions.... Any measure that would materially strengthen the peacemaking authority of the United Nations would encounter considerable opposition from American domestic opinion."¹ The United States, Ball reminds us, refused to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. It has also not ratified the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the use of chemical weapons in war.

The American historian Stanley Hoffmann draws attention to the fact that, although the United States has been free from unjust feudalism ever since it was founded, it has not regarded other countries as equals. Those countries with whom the United States has been friendly "have not been its equals: they have been dependents...". "To Americans, interdependence is a kind of decline in sovereignty.... For other states, interdependence is the norm and does not really affect the core of sovereignty..."² Thus, it is not so much the nationalism of young states as the aggressive nationalism of the developed capitalist states, and the United States in particular, that stands in the way of the utopian project for a world state.

The existence in the world of diametrically opposed socio-economic formations is another most important fact of the modern age underestimated by the "federalists". They regard the organisational approach to the solution of world problems as an absolute, divorcing it from the social basis of these problems. They believe that the "root of all evil" lies in the forms of organisation of human life or, to be more precise, in the forms of inter-state relations. In fact it lies in the social relations within societies, for the nature of the

¹ George W. Ball, "Slogans and Realities", *Foreign Affairs*, July 1969, No. 4, Vol. 47, p. 640.

² S. Hoffmann, "The American Style: Our Past and Our Principles", *Foreign Affairs*, January 1968, No. 2, Vol. 46, pp. 366, 367.

relations between states reflects in a general form the nature of the social relations within states. If the profit motive dominates in a society its relations with other societies will be dominated by the same motive. If the powers that be are afraid of their property being expropriated in their own country, they will show a pathological fear of communism in international relations.

International conflicts are rooted either in the imperfect or the reactionary nature of state social structures, and not only in relations between states. The present socialist and capitalist states, which have diametrically opposed social structures, generally reveal diametrically opposed tendencies and political strategies in their relations with other states, which makes the idea of uniting radically different societies into a single world state organisation a clearly unrealistic one.

The advocates of the world state ignore the crucial fact that the foreign policy of the leading imperialist states has a clearly expressed class nature, which reflects the socio-economic structure of these states. After the Second World War the United States firmly pursued a policy of alliance with corrupt, anti-popular regimes. In the name of the struggle against communism it persistently supported fascist and military dictatorships, intervening in the domestic affairs of other states with the aim of keeping the exploiter classes in power. "The consistency with which Western Powers have supported élites whose function it is to deny political participation and social justice to the people they govern, is one of the more remarkable aspects of post-1945 diplomacy," notes the English specialist in international relations J. Burton.¹ The well-known English historian Arnold Toynbee, who is far from being a communist sympathiser, gives an accurate description of the class role of the United States in the modern world: "...America is today the leader of a world-wide anti-revolutionary movement in defence of vested interests."²

Such descriptions are totally inapplicable to the foreign policy of the socialist states, the essence of which is disinter-

¹ J. W. Burton, "Western Intervention in South-East Asia", *The Year Book of World Affairs*, 1966, London, 1966, pp. 5, 10.

² Arnold J. Toynbee, *America and the World Revolution*, New York and London, 1962, p. 92.

ested help to young states in their economic and cultural development and peaceful coexistence with the developed capitalist states. The class nature of socialist foreign policy, as the policy of the working class in power, is radically opposed to the foreign policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie. This contradiction also makes the uniting of the socialist and capitalist states into a single state impossible.

According to the "federalists" the world state is to be based on the democratic principles of the equality of nations and co-operation and assistance to the less developed countries. They ignore the fact that modern imperialist foreign policy blatantly violates the democratic norms for relations between states, thereby confirming the illusory nature of counting on the "democratic nature" of imperialism. As for the United States, in the words of the American international relations expert D. Fleming, "during the past fifty years the United States has demonstrated a very expensive inability to become a responsible member of the community of nations".¹

All this shows that the "federalists" hopes for a union of imperialist and socialist societies in a single world state are utopian.

Regional associations: two approaches

The fact that the idea of a world state is unrealistic has been well understood by American political leaders, who in the recent past linked this idea with hopes for world domination. If even former US Defence Secretary McNamara states that "the United States has no mandate from on high to police the world...",² one can say with complete certainty that the American imperialists are no longer hoping to retain their leading role even in the so-called free world. Nelson Rockefeller laments bitterly that after the Second World War the United States has "failed ... to face up to the fundamental political problem—the creation of a free world structure of

¹ D. F. Fleming, "Can Pax Americana Succeed?" in *Struggle Against History. U.S. Foreign Policy in the Age of Revolution*. Ed. by Neal D. Houghton, New York, 1968, p. 271.

² Robert S. McNamara, *The Essence of Security. Reflections in Office*, New York, 1968, p. 148.

order and unity".¹ Rockefeller, like some other American leaders, cannot or will not admit that the "failure" of the United States is caused by its attempts to assert the "unity of the free world" on the basis of anti-communism, the arms race, the suppression of national liberation movements, and armed provocations in various parts of the globe.

In the growing opposition to American imperialism in both the less developed and the developed countries, the old argument between the "isolationists" who in the past advocated the non-intervention of the United States in European conflicts and the "anti-isolationists" who support the drawing of the United States into European conflicts has been renewed in the United States. The irony of the situation is that whereas earlier, at the beginning of the century, American isolationism was voluntary, today the US is being forced into isolation by the very course of history; in other words, it is increasingly isolating itself from the rest of the world by actions which its leaders regard as "anti-isolationist".

The basic dilemma of American foreign policy is no longer whether or not it should lay claim to world supremacy. It is now debating the question of whether to retreat into the "castle of America" or continue to "be a world presence". Some American political leaders saw a solution to the problem in the preservation and consolidation of regional blocs in which the United States continues to play a leading role. Nelson Rockefeller expressed these sentiments in his attempt to prove that "the road toward the unity of free nations lies through regional confederations".² Such policy declarations were accompanied by references that set one's teeth on edge to the "challenge of Communist imperialism" and a belittling of the role of the United Nations. The latter, according to Rockefeller, can function only as a "universal symbol of humanity's hopes for peace", as a "forum for voicing and hearing all the divisions and basic conflicts" and as a "channel for daily communication between nations".³

¹ Nelson A. Rockefeller, *The Future of Federalism*, Cambridge, 1962, p. 63.

² Nelson A. Rockefeller, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

³ *Ibid.*

Thus we see the striving of American imperialism to exploit the conception of regionalism to the full in its own interests, which has turned out to be far more vital than the idea of the world state. This forced restriction of the appetites of American imperialism certainly does not mean a change in its aggressive nature, but merely its adaptation to new conditions. For in the regional political, economic and military blocs—NATO, SEATO, CENTO, OAS, and ANZUS—aggressive circles in the United States are trying to pursue the same class, imperialist policy of fighting communism, suppressing national liberation movements and economically exploiting other peoples.

The penetration of the American monopolies into many countries of the world is the economic basis of the US imperialists' persistent support for regional associations. "Today the economy of Canada," writes D. Fleming, "has been substantially taken over, many Latin American states are largely our economic fiefs, Europe is organising against our business take-overs and we fight long and exhausting wars in Asia in no small part to keep areas of investment open to our corporate enterprises."¹

By means of regional alliances the American imperialists are trying, on the one hand, to force upon their "friends" the policy of collective suppression of national liberation movements and collective "defence" against communism, and on the other, to maintain their dominant position in the "free world", among the European, Asian and Latin American capitalist states. Evidence of the imperialist, anti-democratic character of this policy is the systematic violation by the American government of agreements concluded by it with other states. The United States has, for example, frequently violated article 1 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which says that NATO members undertake "to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means... and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force..."² By crushing the popular revolt in Santo Domingo in May 1965 which aimed to restore the democratically elected government to power, the United States grossly violated the OAS Charter, the

¹ D. F. Fleming, op. cit., pp. 274-275.

² *Treaties and Alliances of the World. A Survey of International Treaties in Force and Communities of States*, Bristol, 1968, p. 69.

United Nations Charter and other agreements. In February 1966, US Secretary of State Dean Rusk, addressing the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, openly declared that the military actions of the United States in Asia do not depend on the consent of all members of SEATO.

This, in brief, is the essence of the imperialist conception of regionalism, concealed behind the demagogic sermons of the spiritual and political leaders of American imperialism. This conception is obviously aimed at the principles of international co-operation and radically undermines the effectiveness of existing world organisations, such as the United Nations.

Contrary to the imperialist conception, the socialist conception of regionalism does not proceed from the special interests of a single state, but from the common economic and political interests of groups of states. Whereas the principle of the supremacy of one or several imperialist powers lies at the base of the imperialist blocs, socialist alliances are founded on democratic principles of the equality and mutual respect of states. In the imperialist blocs we find the economic enslavement of some nations by others, whereas in the socialist alliances economic relations are built on principles of co-operation and mutual profit. The imperialist blocs undermine world security, because their strategy opposes the capitalist and socialist states as irreconcilable enemies in the sphere of international relations; the socialist conception of regionalism, however, asserts the need to ensure the mutual, collective security of socialist and capitalist states right up to total exclusion of wars from the life of human society.

The processes taking place today in the world arena illustrate the futility and ineffectiveness of the imperialist conception of regionalism, adopted to arm the US ruling circles. The policy of the United States to maintain and consolidate the American empire has clearly failed. This is seen most clearly in the collapse of the US Vietnam policy, in the inability of the United States and its allies in the imperialist bloc to force its system upon the people of South Vietnam. As the Presidential adviser Henry Kissinger admitted: "Vietnam is more than a failure of policy. It is really a very critical failure of the American philosophy

of international relations."¹ Kissinger did not say what the essence of this policy was, but many people today have realised that it boiled down to a policy of suppressing the national liberation movements and of fighting communism.

The sharp disagreements which have appeared in NATO in the last decade bear witness to the profound crisis undermining this imperialist alliance. The cause of the crisis is the sharpening of economic and political contradictions between the United States and its West European allies. Western Europe, having gained in economic strength, is no longer prepared to accept the domination of the American monopolies in its economy. Even the former British Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, declared that "there is no one on either side of the Channel who wants to see capital investment in Europe involve domination or in the last resort subjugation."² According to the eloquent witness of the American magazine *The Christian Science Monitor*, "Western Europe is today more disturbed about American economic power than about Russian military power."³ This sharpening of economic contradictions between the main capitalist states is no random, temporary phenomenon. It expresses the profound tendency towards division in relations between capitalist states to which Lenin pointed.

In the political sphere, the sharpening of contradictions between the United States and Western Europe has found expression in France's withdrawal from the NATO military organisation, in European opposition to American aggression in Vietnam, and in a number of steps taken by certain capitalist states to improve relations with socialist countries. US Vietnam policy has opened the eyes of many West European politicians to the fact that the European countries could be drawn into armed conflict against their will and against their interests. Consequently, the desire of the West European members of NATO to free themselves from American guardianship and try other ways of consolidating security is understandable and natural.

Anti-communism as an integral part of the imperialist

¹ *No More Vietnams? The War and the Future of American Foreign Policy*. Ed. by Richard M. Pfeffer, New York-Evanston-London, 1968, p. 13.

² *The New York Times*, December 1, 1966.

³ *The Christian Science Monitor*, Boston, December 9, 1966, p. 20.

policy of regionalism has brought this policy to an impasse. There are few people in Europe today who believe in the "Soviet menace". The withdrawal of France from the military organisation of NATO, the improvement of relations between France and the USSR and the conclusion of the treaties between the USSR and the FRG, Poland and the FRG, the GDR and the FRG demonstrate the futility of a policy based on hatred of communism and the formation of anti-communist military blocs.

Some political experts in the West interpret France's historic step as a victory of "blind nationalism" over the "common" interests of the Western states. This interpretation fits in perfectly with their conception that in the modern age nationalism is stronger than communism and capitalism. In fact, however, the sharpening of contradictions within the imperialist blocs denotes the clash of capitalist interests of the various groups of the bourgeoisie. The imperialist nationalism of the American bourgeoisie prompts it to use all possible means to preserve the existing regional associations in which the United States occupies a supreme position. The economic and political interests of the West European bourgeoisie dictate to it the need for adopting a policy independent of American imperialism, the need for finding new ways of ensuring their national security.

This conflict in the national capitalist aims of the various groups of the bourgeoisie lies at the base of the well-known contradiction between the "Atlantic" conception preached by the US reactionary circles and the "united Europe" conception proposed by De Gaulle.

In modern conditions the idea of uniting the socialist and capitalist states into a sort of United States of Europe looks as utopian as the idea of the world state. The most realistic way of uniting Europe at the present stage is to unite it around certain common tasks, the main one being the task of ensuring collective security.

The meeting of leaders of member-states of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation in March 1969 drew attention to this important task, noting that at the present time there is a real possibility of ensuring European security through joint efforts, taking into account the interests of all the states and peoples of Europe. "A stable system of European security," says the Address accepted at the meeting, "cre-

ates the objective possibility and necessity for carrying out by joint efforts large-scale projects in the sphere of power, transport, water, air and health, which are directly related to the well-being of the population of the whole continent. It is this common ground which can and should serve as the foundation of European co-operation."¹

The 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union confirmed the correctness of and vital need for a policy ensuring collective security in Europe. The Congress noted that the European states could agree not to violate the frontiers set up after the Second World War, to eliminate military blocs, ban the use of nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons and reduce armed forces in Europe.

The West European states are today faced with the choice of either continuing the old bankrupt policy of participating in imperialist regional blocs under the aegis of the United States, or pursuing a policy, dictated by national interests and the interests of preserving peace, a policy of good-neighbourly relations with the socialist countries and of ensuring collective security in Europe. The choice of a new path in foreign politics would help to strengthen the role of the United Nations as an organisation for ensuring peace and co-operation on a world-wide scale.

A considerable contribution to the reduction of tension in Europe has been made by such events as the visit to France of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev, the conclusion and ratification of the treaties between the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany, and between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Polish People's Republic, and also the signing of the four-power agreement on West Berlin.

The fierce political struggle in West Germany over the ratification of the treaties has shown that there are still political forces in Europe which seek to prevent détente in this key part of the globe. One of the important results of the struggle for the ratification of the treaties—the struggle between forces which take a realistic view of socio-political trends in European development and the tremendous importance of normalising relations with the socialist states and forces which pursue a revanchist policy—is that broad

¹ *Pravda*, March 18, 1969.

sectors of the West German public have come out in favour of a peace-loving policy towards the FRG's neighbours.

The ratification of the Soviet-West German treaty by the West German parliament and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has evoked exclusively favourable response in Europe and throughout the world, because the treaty is in the interests of all peoples, and is a stimulus for further steps aimed at solving the crucial questions of modern political development in Europe.

The conclusion of the treaty on the principles of relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany is of great significance for the reduction of tension in Europe. The ratification and coming into force of this treaty will have a most favourable influence on the further improvement of the political climate in Europe.

The visit of Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to the Federal Republic of Germany at the invitation of the Federal Chancellor Willi Brandt has made an important contribution to the struggle to reduce international tension.

This visit consolidates the change in relations with a state, which until recently stood at opposite poles from the USSR on almost all major international issues, a change to new relations normal in peace time and to mutually advantageous cooperation. The visit has effectively implemented the foreign policy line of the CPSU and the Soviet government, and is of great importance for further progress along the path of reducing tension and consolidating the peace and security of all the peoples of Europe.

To biased politicians in the West the initiative of the socialist states to ensure peace in Europe appears as an attempt to split the West, to drive a wedge between Western Europe and the United States. These people deliberately ignore the fact that the Soviet Union is doing everything within its power to reach agreement with the United States on the suspension and total cessation of the arms race in order to strengthen the role of the United Nations in preserving peace. The true aim of socialist foreign policy is not to "split" the West, but to replace the existing military blocs by a reliable system of security. The setting up in

Europe of a system of collective security would be a considerable step forward along the path to a future free from war.

The argument that the USSR is trying to divide the West has also been refuted by the recent high-level Soviet-American talks held at the end of May 1972 in Moscow during President Nixon's visit. The Soviet-American agreements on limiting strategic weapons and the principles of relations between the USSR and USA are clear proof that the Soviet Union wishes to establish good-neighbourly relations with both the European countries and the United States.

The real path of struggle for peace and security is the path against the imperialist policy of aggression. And if, in the years following the defeat of nazi Germany, mankind has been spared the horrors of a new world war, this historic achievement owes much to the tremendous contribution of the Soviet Union and its peace-loving foreign policy.

Against the aggressive course of imperialism, the Soviet Union sets up a policy of active defence of peace and strengthening international security.

The activity of the Soviet Union in international affairs is determined by the fine aims of Soviet foreign policy, which are proclaimed honestly and openly. These aims include ensuring, together with the other socialist countries, favourable international conditions for building socialism and communism; consolidating the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries, their friendship and brotherhood; supporting national liberation movements and effecting co-operation with the developing countries; consistently defending the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, and delivering mankind from a new world war.

The Report of the General Secretary of the Party Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev, to the 24th Congress of the CPSU proposed a concrete peace programme consisting of six points.

The CPSU sees the main tasks of such a programme in modern conditions as follows.

One. To eliminate military hot-beds in South-East Asia and the Middle East and to promote a political settlement in these areas on the basis of respect for the legitimate rights of states and peoples subjected to aggression. To give imme-

diate and firm resistance to any act of aggression and international violence. To this end full use must also be made of the possibilities of the United Nations.

Renunciation of the use of force and the threat of its use to solve disputes should become a law of international life. For its part, the Soviet Union proposes that countries who share this view should conclude corresponding bilateral or regional agreements.

Two. To proceed from final recognition of the territorial changes which have taken place in Europe as a result of the Second World War, to bring about a radical change directed at a relaxation of tension and peace on this continent, and to ensure the convocation and success of an all-European conference.

To do everything possible to ensure the collective security of Europe. The Soviet Union confirms the readiness, expressed jointly by the member-countries of the defensive Warsaw Treaty Organisation, to annul this Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty simultaneously or—as a first step—to do away with their military organisations.

Three. To conclude treaties banning nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons.

To campaign for the cessation of all nuclear tests everywhere, including underground tests.

To promote the creation of non-nuclear zones in various parts of the world.

The Soviet Union supports nuclear disarmament by all states possessing nuclear weapons, and the convocation to this end of a conference of the five nuclear powers—the Soviet Union, the United States, China, France and Britain.

Four. To activate the struggle for putting an end to armament of all kinds. The Soviet Union is in favour of the convocation of a world conference to examine questions of disarmament in their full scope, of the abolition of foreign military bases, of reducing armed forces and armaments in areas where military confrontation is particularly dangerous, above all in Central Europe.

The Soviet Union regards it as advisable to work out measures for reducing the likelihood of the accidental emergence or intentional fabrication of military incidents and their development into international crises and war.

The Soviet Union is ready to agree to a reduction of

military expenditure, first and foremost by the large states.

Five. The UN resolutions on the abolition of remaining colonial regimes should be fully put into effect. All manifestations of racism and apartheid should be universally condemned and boycotted.

Six. The Soviet Union is ready to deepen relations of mutually profitable cooperation in all spheres with states which are also striving towards the same aim. The USSR is ready to participate together with other interested states in solving such problems as the conservation of the environment, the exploitation of fuel and other natural resources, the development of transport and communications, the detection and elimination of dangerous and widespread diseases, and the exploration of outer space and the oceans.

This, in its broad outline, is the programme for peace and international cooperation, for the freedom and independence of peoples, advanced by the Soviet Union.¹

It is a well-known fact that the forces of militarism and aggression are far from having been rendered harmless. The threat of a new world war cannot be regarded as having been eliminated.

The sacred duty of all peace-loving states and peoples is to prevent this threat from becoming a reality. It is this that the Soviet programme of peace and international cooperation, of the freedom and independence of peoples, urges, opening up broad prospects for the activation and alliance of forces in this struggle.

Chapter 5

THE "FORMED SOCIETY"—A TOTALITARIAN CONCEPTION

In recent times alongside the search for a historical future for capitalism, imperialist ideologists have increasingly attempted to justify with the help of the most refined theoretical constructions the "inevitability", "logic", and "historical conditionality" of the most anti-humane and anti-democratic actions of the bourgeois state and the monopolistic ruling circles.

Today the only socio-political conceptions which satis-

¹ See *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, pp. 37-39.

fy more or less fully the requirements of the bosses in the capitalist world and respond to their demands are those which contain the solution to a dual task: to create sufficiently effective propaganda for the brainwashing of the working masses and to provide a theoretical basis for the policy of the bourgeois state on the broadest level (economic and trade policy, international relations, changes in legislation, etc.). Modern capitalism is adapting itself to the new situation in the world. In particular, "the monopolies have been making extensive use of scientific and technical achievements to fortify their positions..."¹ One of the ways of this making use of scientific achievements are the constant attempts of bourgeois ideologists to develop theories of the development of society, which to some extent or other take into account historical reality and help the monopolies and the state to solve individual problems of production, politics and other tasks confronting the ruling class. It is on this basis that "programme forecasts" are drawn up, which claim to predict the future and organise it according to a certain plan.

One of these programme forecasts is the theory of the "formed society" ("die formierte Gesellschaft"), developed by West German sociologists and politicians.²

The theory of the "formed society" is one of the most typical conceptions of modern bourgeois ideology. Like all "new" bourgeois social theories, it has absorbed a multitude of most heterogeneous, eclectically mixed socio-economic and political ideas from various sources. At the same time the "formed society" is the "programme of action" and remains the strategic aim of the Christian Democratic Union. By disseminating the idea of the "formed society" the CDU is attempting to force the masses in West Germany to support the monopoly élite in attaining its egoistic socio-economic and ideological aims, and to present bourgeois reforms as radical changes in the system of modern capitalism.

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 20.

² The basic tenets of this theory were expounded at the 13th Party Congress of the Christian Democratic Union (1965) by Ludwig Erhard and in the following speeches by his assistants. They were supplemented and given concrete form in the 12 theses published in the CDU's theoretical journal *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*. But a long time before this many West German politicians, ideologists and sociologists have worked on the formulation and summarising of these tenets.

Although it reflects certain tendencies in the evolution of state-monopoly capitalism, the theory of the "formed society" misinterprets them, trying to instil a system of ideas into the working people which would create the illusion of attaining a "social peace" within the framework of capitalist society and, consequently, kindle the hope of perfecting capitalism without the abolition of private ownership and the political institutions based upon it.

In attempting to "get along" somehow with present-day trends in social development and smooth over the sharpening contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist mode of appropriation, the theory of the "formed society" is forced to "borrow" some Marxist ideas and feed off them. In so doing it distorts and weakens the basic content of these ideas. Thus, taking the indisputably proved proposition on the role of the material factor in the life of society, the theoreticians of the "formed society" attempt to treat social development solely from the technical and economic standpoints, trying to strengthen the role of "equalising" factors, and entirely ignoring the need to distinguish between important and unimportant phenomena, main and secondary ones, basic and derivative, and so on in the highly complex web of social life. The question of the essence and nature of social life is not raised at all.

Another Marxist tenet about the primacy of productive forces in the system of social production and that forms of social life are determined by the mode of production, they attempt to reduce to the development of productive forces and even more narrowly to the prospects for modern industrialisation. With regard to production relations they either ignore them or replace them by technological or technical organisational relations. They identify material interests and their respective structures with the interests of the ruling classes, reducing the whole process of social development to the "bourgeoisification" and the "levelling" of society, to the division of labour between the employers and managers. In this the working class remains the object of manipulation by employers and managers. Everywhere balance prevails: between "the dynamics of economics and social stability", between "social perspective and private initiative"; "co-operation" and "interdependence" become the predominant feature of society, and, there-

fore, it is "no longer shaken" by social and "cultural" conflicts.

Unlike many preceding theories which stated the existing position and regarded as an absolute the isolated achievements of the capitalist world (for example, "people's capitalism" with its slogans of "universal prosperity", "isolation in a golden frame" and so on), the theory of the "formed society" attempts to provide a future for social development on a "non-communist path". It is stressed in all manner of ways that the growth of the "formed society" is a long historical process. Thus, it is shown as a remote, alluring prospect, promising "abundance and harmony" for all members of society; but in order to attain it one must "sweat and toil", and first it is necessary to achieve the "unity of the nation", "production unity", to turn the whole of society into a closely-knit, vitally active mechanism, driven by a "single state consciousness"—in the name of and for the sake of strengthening the foundations of capitalism. Thus it is obvious that the theory of the "formed society" is far from being a purely speculative, academic scheme. On the contrary, it answers the innermost interests of the West German imperialists and in this sense is a "working theory". It serves as one of the theoretical premises of the socio-political strategy of state monopoly capital in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The theory of the "formed society" is the strategic conception of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), the main aim of which is to stabilise and develop the state monopoly system in West Germany, to train the whole country to carry out plans of aggression, and to launch further attacks on the vital interests of the working people and their rights.

The "formed society" is presented as a social and ideological conception which provides a theoretical basis for the changes in West German society desired by the monopolies, and also for the political strategy of the state monopoly machine in the Federal Republic. Unlike many conceptions which bourgeois thought has developed for its internal requirements—"people's capitalism", "market economy", "social partnership" and others—the programme of the "formed society" is equipped with a foreign policy doctrine designed to activate anti-communism.

The "formed society", Erhard announced, "is not a model which functions only within the national state. It is rather that a general picture of a *united Europe* can be imprinted in it. Moreover, it is also suitable to be the leading idea for the transformation of our part of the earth and also for the economic and social development of *other peoples*. If this step of ours is successful, the magnetic force of a society formed in this way will show its superiority over other forms (forms of social organisation—*L. A.*). At the same time it will destroy socialism ideologically and politically...."¹

For many years the West German imperialists plotted a "global" attack on socialism,² insisting on the need for the military, economic and political integration of Western Europe in an alliance with the United States. In Europe they claim the role of the leading force since, in their opinion, West Germany has advanced farther along the path to the "formed society" than its allies. "In this process (of "forming"—*L.A.*)," Erhard develops his idea, "are contained the prospects for our relations with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. All these countries are looking for a model which could help them create a synthesis of freedom and order, of a progressive technical-economic structure and a distinctive culture."³ In other words, the West German social "model" is designed to serve as an instrument for neo-colonialism and an ideological means of luring away from the socialist countries those nations which have embarked on the non-capitalist path of development after the Second World War.

In a situation of sharpening class antagonisms the West German monopoly bourgeoisie is alarmed by the fact that the Communists and the opposition are becoming increasingly successful at elections and other political campaigns. Resorting to direct coercion with regard to the working people, the monopolists are also looking for ways and means of deceiving the West German population. They are doing their utmost to develop ways and means of dulling the work-

¹ L. Erhard, "Programm für die politische Ordnung Deutschlands", *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, H. 7, Bonn, 1965, S. 74.

² R. Altmann, *Das Erbe Adenauers*, München, 1963.

³ L. Erhard, "Der Weg in die Formierte Gesellschaft", *Epoca*, 1965, N. 8.

ers' class consciousness, and to present their own interest as the "common interest" of all members of society and thus prove the need for strengthening so-called "national authority", which is concerned with the "general well-being" of its wards. The West German imperialists have restored and consolidated their power, but this is not enough for them to increase the rate of economic growth now that the "economic miracle" has ceased, or to raise military potential even higher and carry out their expansionist designs. They wish to subordinate society to united aims and put an end once and for all to competing interests, to concentrate all political and economic power in a few hands, and to achieve not only the productive but also the spiritual subjection of the whole population of West Germany.

At a time of rapid growth in state monopoly capitalism which has become a gigantic mechanism for redistributing the national wealth in favour of the monopolies, the latter are now confronted point-blank with the task of planning ("regulating") the economy (and other social phenomena) on the scale of the whole of society, which is possible to its full extent only by bypassing the limits of the capitalist mode of production. The theoreticians of the "formed society" are attempting to bring together "public prospect and private initiative" to attain the "common good" on a capitalist basis for the sake of realising "general political" interests.¹ They assign a key role in West German policy to the military-monopoly state machine.

The state, they explain, "...intervenes in the economic sphere on the basis of its responsibility for the common good in cases of disturbance and disorder, and also in the realisation of its general political aims, but in such a way as to interfere as little as possible with private initiative and free price formation".² The references to the "common good" and "general political aims" are intended to conceal the class orientation of capitalist programming. The natural regulator of the economy turns out to be the state which, according to the authors of the theory, is alone responsible for both the "common good" and the realisation of "general

¹ *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, H. 10, Bonn, 1965, S. 113; H. 7, S. 73; H. 13/14, S. 161.

² *Ibid.*, H. 13/14, S. 161.

political aims" which consist of the rapid, planned "forming" of society on a single basis. The theoreticians of the "formed society" see the aim of the state as that of regulating the economy in establishing definite proportions "between public and private initiative"; the latter is subordinated to the former in cases where they diverge. Naturally, such cases are unlikely if one takes into account that the "public prospect" means the ensuring of the most favourable conditions possible for the "private initiative" of the West German monopolies.

This principle of subordination becomes even more obvious if one takes into account that the "formed society", presented as a "single enterprise", consists of "sub-enterprises": of employers, trade unions, agricultural and other organisations, among which, according to the theoreticians of "forming", it is not worth reducing only the former to a common denominator in order "not to disturb the dynamics of economic development". Thus, the interests of the employers are presented as being basic and inviolable.

"The dynamics of the economy," writes R. Altmann, "the concentration on a prolonged raising of performance and the use of technical and economic progress inside the capitalist economy must not be included in the formation of groups."¹ To our mind, it would be one-sided to follow the author in concluding from this that the dynamics of the economy "should not be subordinated to the formation of groups".

In fact the point here is the further consolidation of the positions of large capital in politics and economics, the desire to set up the unrestricted rule of a handful of monopolists who enjoy tremendous power in the Bonn state. However, it does not follow, according to the CDU programme in question, that the monopolies are not liable to be "formed". The points at issue here are:

further consolidation and centralisation of all economic, financial, fiscal, human and other resources in order to attain the more long-term strategic—economic and political—blatantly expansionist aims of state monopoly capital as a whole;

¹ Ibid., H. 10, S. 114.

multiplication and extension of the functions of the capitalist state at the state-monopoly stage, which is assigned an increasingly large role by the leading monopoly groups in managing the affairs of the class of capitalists as a whole.

"By acting in the interests of the whole of monopoly capital, the state may at times oppose individual monopolies or groups of monopolies. By exerting pressure on some groups of monopoly capital and supporting others, giving certain advantages to some non-monopoly sectors of the economy, and supplementing private ownership with state ownership, it has shown itself to be a force capable of actively influencing the general conditions of reproduction, exploitation and the receipt of high profits by monopoly capital."¹

In short, the state may oppose individual monopolies or groups of monopolies on behalf of that "common good" which expresses the vital interests of the monopoly class as a whole.²

Bourgeois ideologists have expended a great deal of effort on trying to prove the gradual disappearance of antagonistic classes in modern bourgeois society. The theoreticians of the "formed society" have tried to prove that there are no longer any classes or groups in West Germany, which would express and defend incompatible interests and aims. Instead a society has been created based on the "voluntary interaction of all groups and interests", on the "cooperation" of all members of society for the sake of "common social aims".³

Thus, it is a question of ceasing the class struggle for a change in the given social order. From this it is clear that the authors of the conception of the "formed society" have been trying from the outset to evade the solution of the main contradiction in capitalist society—the contradiction between labour and capital. Their basic concern is to pre-

¹ *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya* (World Economy and International Relations), 1967, No. 5, p. 9.

² In fact contradictions exist not only between the short- and long-term interests of monopoly capital as a whole, but also between the interests of individual monopoly groups, particularly in international affairs, where these groups by no means always adopt a single position.

³ *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, H. 13/14, S. 159.

serve the foundations of modern capitalist society at a time of increasing socialisation in all spheres of the economy.

This desire to perpetuate capitalism is met, in particular, by the attempts of the theoreticians of the "formed society" to give their model the appearance of being historically grounded, because at the present level of scientific knowledge only a programme for the future based on the experience of the past and proceeding from the principle of development can be regarded as well substantiated. Unlike similar modern bourgeois theories (such as those of the "stages of growth" and the "modern industrial society"), whose historicism is directed mainly towards solving economic questions, the "formed society" claims historicism in the socio-political sphere as well.

West German society, assert the theoreticians of "forming", is in a transition stage from a "pluralist society of unions" (second phase) to the "formed society", while the first phase was the "class society of the 19th century". By the latter is meant capitalist society which "still (!) fell" into classes expressing antagonistic economic and socialist interests and fighting for the transformation of the social order. Capital and labour are estranged here as parties of the labour market. "The class antagonism of capitalist society", explains Johannes Messner, "is not only economic, as between the various economic groups, but also social."¹ To quote the authors of the forming theory, Karl Marx's conclusions were "correct" only in relation to this age: the immaturity of social relations in the 19th century not only did not exclude revolutions, but even presupposed them. Here the bourgeois theoreticians are resorting to their favourite device of "retrospective acknowledgement" of class contradictions, thereby trying to show that they do not reject the class division of society on principle, which, according to them, was characteristic of the preceding period of social development.

The second phase of "forming society"—a higher one and, therefore, determining the trend of subsequent social development—consists of the formation of a "pluralist society of unions", in which all groups have already recognised the social order and are fighting not for this or that

¹ Ibid., H. 13/14, S. 158.

principle of social organisation, but for their share in the social product. Local unions defend their selfish interests, but they no longer have a concrete adversary in the form of an antagonistic class. From this it is concluded that social revolution is excluded, but not finally, because social cataclysms may return the nation to the first phase. The "unions" by no means understand the interests of society as a whole. "The pluralism of the consolidated unions," writes Goetz Briefs, "excludes all social satisfaction as long as it acts according to the law of the priority of the respective claims of the groups."¹ The second phase, unlike the first, has a model of economic organisation—the "social market economy", but the "interests of the dynamics of the economy" are not yet developed in it.

With the help of this "explanation" bourgeois ideologists try to convince the working people that the class division is an anachronism which has no place in modern society. They strive to extinguish in the minds of the working people all desire to change the existing conditions, and make use of everyday, consumer, private interests which are more immediate and obvious, and do not need to be mastered by the bearers of revolutionary theory.

Like the majority of modern bourgeois theories, the model of the "formed society" is orientated towards the philistine consciousness in these questions. It is directed towards the abolition of class consciousness in the workers, towards the transformation of class self-consciousness into self-consciousness of the philistine who is content to satisfy direct, temporary interests. In this way the theoreticians of the "formed society" hope to limit working people's understanding of social problems within the framework of group and local interests that do not extend beyond the limits of the factory, office, family, etc.

The third phase—the "formed society"—is presented as a society with extraordinarily high social and economic stability. The creation of this society, its authors claim, is a long purposeful process. According to them, it began in 1921, and after some intervals connected with the crisis of 1929 and the post-war recovery period, was renewed in 1948 after the Western powers "inspired the split in Germany".

¹ *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, H. 13/14, S. 158.

The ultimate aim of this "forming" is the final departure from the principle of "social pluralism", the orientation of all social groups towards the "common good", and consequently a departure from the so-called democracy of the unions, the subordination of group interests to a single "national" interest based on the interests of the monopoly ruling circles. The system of measures of so-called interdependence in the theory of the "formed society" serves as one of the mechanisms of this subordination.

The thesis of the close interdependence of all the links in society is advanced by the theoreticians of "forming" as a main and decisive one. They persistently call for the overcoming of the "separateness and isolation of individual groups" (Erhard) in society; the ideal they advance is the "formed-integrated society" in which "consolidated groups" arrive at relations of interdependence, which do not exclude conflicts and tension, but all in all do not "contradict the good of the whole of society". By the term "consolidated groups" is meant "unions of interested parties" which have a legal status in that they are recognised by the state.¹ The concept "consolidated groups" is extended here to all links in society, from production collectives (including agricultural ones) to trade unions, the press and the smallest social organisations. The authors of this conception do not insist, therefore, on the creation of a society in which there will be no conflicts whatsoever, but they think it possible to have an "integrated society" whose unity and solidarity are not threatened by anything. They regard as a prerequisite for this integration the overcoming of the destructive action of pluralism, which will remain as long as there are disconnected organisations; this should result in "a vital relation between social stability and economic dynamics".² For the sake of these aims it is demanded that the interests of all groups be subordinated to higher interests—those of the community, the whole, the process of forming.

Thus, integration becomes the dominating feature of society. The "disintegrated society", the members of

¹ Ibid. S. 159.

² Ibid., H. 7, S. 74.

which are disconnected and antagonistic, conceals within itself the danger of loss of unity. Apart from everything else the "consolidated groups" must be recognised by the state and society. The West German Communists do not belong to them; this non-recognition can, evidently, be applied to any progressive organisation if it is accused of causing society to disintegrate. As long as the "consolidated groups" concentrate on their own interests and do not show any or sufficient interest in the "common good" the process of "forming" is impossible and their "selfish interests" threaten the well-being and future of the whole nation, for "in order to be capable of action a society needs generally binding aims, i.e., ones which are valid for *all* the members of this society".¹ These demands are undoubtedly aimed against the interests of the working people of West Germany, who today make up 80 per cent of the total population. As a result the "formed society" presents itself as a "single enterprise" of a definite type, an enterprise functioning in the spirit of large capital which controls it.

In practice this orientation towards the "common good" forces the subordinated classes to renounce all forms of class struggle, which are represented by the monopoly bourgeoisie as obsolete.

At the same time the aim is to mobilise the working people to carry out the tasks of the monopoly bourgeoisie and its state apparatus. The worker is deprived of his inalienable right to uphold his own interests and is consoled with the illusion of redistribution of the social product; democracy is permitted insofar as it profits the monopolies. The undermining of the foundations of democracy is expressed primarily in restricting the rights of legislative bodies and in extending the rights of executive bodies; in excessive growth of the state apparatus which is removed from the control of the community and democratic forces; in lack of opportunity for the working people to exert any influence whatsoever in this sphere; and in bureaucratic centralism and general bureaucratisation of the state apparatus.

Reactionary circles in West Germany regard the existing system of a parliamentary democracy as obsolete and urge

¹ *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, H. 7, S. 162.

its "modernisation". They see the combination of the following two tasks as their main problem:

a) the need to preserve—albeit in words only—the "free democratic" forms of state organisation;

b) the need to consolidate the "unity of the nation" by subordinating all groups and individuals, their thoughts and actions, to the demands of state monopoly capital.

The ideologists of "forming" propose a whole system of measures for "restricting and controlling groups" which engage in politics. This by no means refers to neo-nazi and various Right-wing extremist forces, but to those democratic organisations which represent the majority of the population and act in defence of the most elementary freedoms and against force and oppression.

The greatest danger from the proposed "modernisation and reform of democracy" lies in the fact that the West German reactionary circles once succeeded in foisting on the population an "extraordinary constitution" which made provision for coercive measures in relation to workers' and progressive organisations. The anti-democratic measures planned for the future are being given legal form, including the declaration of a state of siege in cases of so-called complications in peace time. These measures are the logical continuation of such anti-democratic actions as the prosecution of anti-fascists.

The theoreticians of "forming" leave us in no doubt whatsoever as to the nature and aims of the reforms they are proposing, when they regard the extension of democratic institutions as the "perversion of democratic thought", the "logical prototype of the totalitarian collective". They call the demands of the trade unions and other mass organisations "democratism" which, according to Goetz Briefs, "is a considerable danger to the freedom and dignity of man, and also to all his social institutions". "The formed society" cannot be a "liberal constitutional state of the parliamentary type,"¹ writes Briefs. From this it is clear that the "universality" of the political aims and interests has a specific shade of meaning here: it is seen as the "integration" of all groups and unions with the prevailing state monopoly system,

¹ Ibid., H. 13/14, S. 160.

proceeding from the need for subordination—voluntary, but unconditional—of all members of society to the interests and aims of the monopoly élite. “If the groups and associations do not unite voluntarily...,” writes the *Handelsblatt*, the newspaper of the big industrialists, “one must reckon on the state taking vigorous action with an iron fist.”¹

Bourgeois ideologists no longer attempt to deny the crisis of bourgeois parliamentarism, but use it to justify further infringement of the rights of the working people and to strengthen the capitalist state control over all spheres of socio-economic life in West Germany. The old bourgeois idea about the supra-class character of the capitalist state and about this organ for reconciling class interests is given a “new” interpretation here. The state no longer reconciles the interests of all classes, but expresses to a certain extent the arithmetical mean of these classes. On this basis an attempt is made to subordinate to the regulating authority of the state not only the heterogeneous and contradictory interests of the various social strata and groups and even opposed classes, but also the whole spiritual life of society: ideology, the arts, artistic tastes and moral values.

The striving of the monopoly bourgeoisie to exert an active influence on social processes in their own class interests is not confined to the sphere of material and constitutional relations. To achieve the economic and political stabilisation of the state-monopoly system the latter needs to gain control of the consciousness of the broad masses, to mobilise them to attain the aims of the monopoly organisations both at home and in the international arena.

The demand to unify the ideology and culture of West Germany within the so-called social consciousness is regarded as an essential prerequisite for “forming”. This consciousness expresses itself in “public opinion and in politics through concrete measures in laws, regulations and also in actions”.²

¹ Schwank, K. H., “*Formierte Gesellschaft*”. *Schlagwort oder drohende Gefahr?*, Berlin, 1966, S. 60.

² Leo Schütze, “Zum politischen und geschichtlichen Aspekt der Formierten Gesellschaft” in *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, 1965, H. 10, S. 109.

The theoreticians of "forming" proceed from the realisation by all strata of society of the aim of action as the main condition for the success of practical activity, having in mind the attainment of aims which are compulsory for all members of society. As an example of a broad campaign for attaining these compulsory aims they quote the joint efforts of the West German population to restore the country's economy in the post-war period.

As with other key tenets of the conception under review, the unification of "social consciousness" is based on the principle of "viewing society as a whole"¹. "Social consciousness" is an essential "prerequisite for the integration of individuals and groups in society and state. If this consciousness does not exist in a society or if it is too weakly developed, this is an extremely weak point in times of crisis; in an unfavourable situation there is even the danger that the society will fall apart"².

The authors of the theory criticise monopoly associations for "not developing the social consciousness sufficiently."³ This criticism reflects the contradictions between the various monopoly groups in relation to a policy of ~~the~~ the highest profits and the final enslavement of society. The working people are trained to accept the planned economic and political measures as essential and dictated by the requirements of the whole people.

Turning the role of "social consciousness" into an absolute for attaining socio-economic aims is a characteristic principle of modern bourgeois methodology which makes the theory of the "formed society" akin to nazi ideology. Small wonder that bourgeois ideologists try to find in the nazi past historical prerequisites for the socio-political structure of the "formed society". R. Altmann, for example, searches in the highly militarised National Socialist state system for the very prototype of a social structure which, according to him, lies at the basis of the "formed society". The process of "forming" (i.e., the forming of the "formed society"), to quote Altmann, "would hardly have produced the results

¹ Leo Schütze and Werner Riek, "Bericht über Altmanns Referat", in *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, 1965, H. 10, S. 112.

² *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, H. 13/14, S. 163.

³ *Ibid.*

which we (i.e., the West German monopolies—*L. A.*) have today, without the National Socialist period",¹ which "rallied all strata of the population around the predominant National Socialist ideology".

To quote the well-known West German bourgeois sociologist R. Dahrendorf, "one can observe a tendency to manipulate people and mould society, which may be described as a tendency towards the acceleration of fascism".²

But a sufficiently full realisation of this tendency in practice is impossible without destroying traditional democratic illusions, without the relevant ideological and socio-psychological brainwashing of the population, and without spreading a unitary ideology of the fascist type.

There can be no doubt about the reactionary orientation of the theory of the "formed society", which tries to subject to the strict control of the monopoly élite not only the economic, but also the spiritual and cultural life of society, the mass media, which are being turned into a form of mass industry.

The theory of the "formed society" is an attempt to argue the need for "collegial dictatorship" of the monopoly élite, which shows that the bourgeoisie in modern conditions are shamelessly arming themselves with theories which have compromised themselves in the eyes of the general public as being extremely reactionary.

The "formed society" theory reflects the inherent trend of reactionary bourgeois ideology to depart from the basic principles of social pluralism. This departure also means the striving of imperialist bourgeoisie to have done with certain bourgeois democratic illusions and switch to an open and cynical attack on the democratic gains of the working masses.

A knowledge of all these strategic and tactical manoeuvres of bourgeois ideologists is essential for an effective and purposeful struggle against reactionary bourgeois ideology. Marxism-Leninism, basing itself on the revolutionary dialectics, provides us with the means of revealing the official

¹ *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare*, H. 10, S. 112.

² R. Dahrendorf, *Für eine Erneuerung der Demokratie in der Bundesrepublik*, München, 1968, S. 164.

socio-political role and scientific untenability of the various "new" theories justifying the further "development" of moribund capitalist society.

Chapter 6

MANKIND'S FUTURE AS SEEN BY RIGHT SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

Questions relating to the future of mankind have always occupied a central position in the socio-political views of all Social Democrats. "The future is neither for capitalism nor socialism" was the leitmotif of a collection of articles entitled *Social Democracy in Europe* (1966), the contributors to which included Bruno Pittermann, Chairman of the Socialist International, Tage Erlander, its former Vice-Chairman, and leaders of Socialist and Social Democratic parties in Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands, Norway and West Germany. In their articles they show the ways and means of realising the reformist, futurological ideal, the attainment of which these writers call "a world society of affluence".¹

The authors of another collection entitled *Das Gesellschaftsbild des Sozialismus* (*The Social Picture of Socialism*), the Austrian Socialists Christian Broda, Fritz Klenner, Norbert Leser and Josef Hindels pose the question of the further development of the conception of "democratic socialism" as the best alternative to capitalism and socialism. They see the paths of mankind's development as lying in a synthesis of neo-capitalism with socialism and "neo-communism" with a market economy.²

Developing these thoughts the well-known West German Social Democrat Waldemar von Knoerringen, in an article published in the magazine *Neues Forum*, suggests that all Social Democratic parties should meet and set up a body for "scientific research" (!) into the theory of "democratic socialism" and the prospects for human development outlined by this theory.³

The documents of the international Communist and

¹ *Sozialdemokratie in Europa*, Hannover, 1966.

² *Das Gesellschaftsbild des Sozialismus*, Wien, 1966.

³ *Neues Forum*, Wien, 1966, Heft 154.

working-class movement and the CPSU Programme contain a detailed criticism of the Right-wing socialist conception of "democratic socialism", showing its untenability and hostility to the vital interests of the working class and the toiling masses. "The Right wing of Social Democracy," says the CPSU Programme, "has completely broken with Marxism and contraposed so-called democratic socialism to scientific socialism. Its adherents deny the existence of antagonistic classes and the class struggle in bourgeois society; they forcefully deny the necessity of the proletarian revolution and oppose the abolition of private ownership of the means of production. They assert that capitalism is being "transformed" into socialism.... Anti-communism has brought social reformism to an ideological and political impasse."¹

Substantial changes have taken place in the world since the whole Right wing of Social Democracy accepted the conception of "democratic socialism" as a futurological ideal. The deepening of the general crisis of capitalism is continuing, as is the growth of the influence of the world socialist system, and the working-class and national liberation movements. Together with other factors the scientific and technological revolution has sharpened the basic contradiction of the capitalist mode of production, increasingly creating the material-economic and subjective prerequisites for socialism. The consolidation of the state-monopoly system in the developed capitalist countries, the growth of the power of the monopolies has led to a deepening of the antagonisms between the monopolistic ruling circles and the other social strata. Suffering from state monopoly regulation, aimed against these strata, the latter, particularly the lower and middle bourgeoisie, are becoming increasingly interested in limiting the power of the monopolies. In this connection reformism is faced with the dilemma of either defending democracy and the "middle strata" and hence against the monopolies or going over to an open defence of monopoly capitalism.

Given this condition, in which direction is the evolution of the futurological ideal of the Right-wing Social Democrats proceeding?

¹ *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1961, pp. 501, 502.

Let us first examine the content of "democratic socialism" as a plan for the future development of human society.¹

The future of mankind as presented by "democratic socialism" is based on a synthesis of the "best" aspects of modern socio-economic systems, i.e., "pluralism".

On the economic level this pluralism is to express itself in the affirmation of the "socialist market economy", "de-capitalised" and "de-totalitarianised" by means of combining in it, as mutually complementary and mutually conditioning elements, private ownership and competition, on the one hand, and public ownership and planning, on the other.²

There is no unanimity among the theoreticians of "democratic socialism" on the question of the nature of socio-class relations. Some speak about a classless society, others negate this society by maintaining the "pluralist" socio-class structure.³

In the political sphere the Social Democrats assume the establishment of a "mixed" democracy based on the co-existence of "de-ideologised" forces and trends. The tasks of the state will be to ensure a "fair" distribution of the national income, to maintain universal prosperity and carry on cultural and educational activities.⁴

It cannot be denied that the conception of "democratic socialism" advances a number of attractive prospects for certain strata of the population. It talks of socialism, promises prosperity to the "economically and socially weak",

¹ Although Right Socialist theoreticians maintain that there are many versions of "democratic socialism", so different that it is impossible to compare them (*Zukunft*, 1967, Heft 5, S. 1), in fact they all repeat one another basically, having a common platform in the Frankfurt Declaration of 1951 and the statement of the General Council of the Socialist International entitled *The World from the Socialist Point of View* (1962). For the purpose of analysis we are taking the development of the West German version of the future of society as an example, since it is here that the most important re-orientation is taking place in relation to the prospects of "democratic socialism".

² K. Nemitz, *Sozialistische Marktwirtschaft*, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1967.

³ W. Eichler, *Weltanschauung und Politik*, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1967, S. 117; W. Theimer, *Der Marxismus*, Bern, 1960, S. 101-102.

⁴ C. Schmidt, *Politik und Geist*, München, 1964, S. 60-79, 187-196; B. Kopp, *Liberalismus und Sozialismus auf dem Weg zur Synthese*, Meisenheim-am-Glan, 1964, S. 116-117.

preaches "democracy", "freedom" and "justice", talks of "restraining" the monopolies and of workers' "participation" in production management, etc. All this lends the Right-wing socialist ideal an outwardly realistic aura. These "attractive" arguments are purely demagogic, however, and "democratic socialism" as a socio-political ideal remains utopian.

The untenability of "democratic socialism" as the future of society is revealed by analysing its basic principle—the "pluralist" character of the future society.

Let us begin by describing the property relations in the future society as it is conceived by West German Right Social Democrats.

It must be emphasised straightaway that Right-wing socialist theoreticians pay very little attention to this question. Thus, in the *Handbuch sozialdemokratische Politik* the concept of "ownership" is not even mentioned.¹ To quote the Social Democratic theoreticians and leaders, the question of ownership in their conception is relegated to second place for two reasons. Firstly, because, as the Bad Godesberg Programme states, the second industrial revolution is creating the prerequisites for raising the overall standard of living and doing away with poverty and want without changing the property relations in society;² secondly, because, in general, managerial functions in the production system are far more important than legally fixed ownership of the means of production. To corroborate this far from new theory the Right Social Democrats usually cite the theory of "managerism" and what they consider to be its "application" in the capitalist and socialist countries.

When they do examine the question of the character of ownership in the future society, however, the Right-wing socialist theoreticians talk about dualism of private and public ownership and stress that the relation between them is based on the principle not of mutual exclusion, but of interdependence and interconditionality.³ In fact, however, the main element in this dualism always turns out to be private ownership. The Bad Godesberg Programme states

¹ *Handbuch sozialdemokratische Politik*, Bonn, 1953.

² *Das Grundsatzprogramm der SPD*, Bonn, 1959.

³ K. Nemitz, *op. cit.*, S. 141, 142.

openly that private ownership may be defended and supported because, as the theoreticians of "democratic socialism" explain, it alone can be the sole guarantee of the freedom and independence of members of society.¹

At the basis of these discussions lies the real fact that ownership in a capitalist society is the basis of the socio-political status of its citizens and determines the degree of their "freedom". But it is quite obvious that private ownership under capitalism can never guarantee equal freedom for all members of society. Being linked with the exploitation of the working people and the pursuit of profit, private ownership in capitalist society leads only to property stratification, to its concentration in the hands of the few and, consequently, to a huge differentiation in respect of social status, possibilities and "freedoms".

As for public ownership, this is regarded simply as a form of "public control" which may be used if and where "a healthy state of economic affairs cannot be ensured by other methods" or if production development cannot be accelerated without it, etc. In short, unlike private ownership, it is not a compulsory element in the "socialist market economy", but a "question of degree and expediency".²

In general the Right Social Democrats are very vague and confused in their discussions of the meaning of public ownership.³ Stressing that "transfer to public ownership" is by no means the same as state ownership, i.e., nationalisation of the means of production in the Marxist sense, they usually describe it in terms of "serving the public good", the "good of the people", etc.⁴ At the same time they do not state concretely who will bring about public ownership and how the transfer of the means of production to public ownership is to be carried out, but confine themselves to listing the various forms of cooperative and public enterprises. As an example they occasionally cite the so-called social community in Hessen, where the property is managed by a special supervisory committee consisting of representa-

¹ *Das Grundsatzprogramm der SPD.*

² K. Nemitz, op. cit., S. 147.

³ This is the conclusion reached, for example, by A. Walz in his book *Vom Sozialismus zum Neosozialismus* (Freiburg, 1965), on the basis of a careful analysis of the works of Right Social Democrats.

⁴ K. Nemitz, op. cit., S. 147-149.

tives of the communes, the "land social community" and factories.¹ Neither the writings of the theoreticians of "democratic socialism" nor the Bad Godesberg Programme contain a clear indication as to the conditions according to which privately owned enterprises may be regarded as liable for "transfer to public ownership". Thus, the West German Right Social Democrats do not in fact even conceive of any serious socialisation of capitalist property, i.e., of changing the prevailing production relations.

The cooperative and "public" enterprises and "social communities" advertised by them are not and cannot be recognised as a social form of public ownership, for their activity does not extend beyond the framework of private property relations and is subject to the law of capitalist production.

Thus, "democratic socialism" as the Right Social Democrats see it from the point of view of property relations, does not extend beyond the framework of the capitalist system in general. The dualism of private and public ownership is in fact a pure fiction, concealing the desire not to restrict but to consolidate capitalist ownership.

The fact that the "democratic socialist" society does not differ basically from modern capitalist society can be seen from an analysis of its socio-class structure. It is true, as mentioned earlier, that certain divergences of opinion concerning the character of the socio-class structure of "democratic socialism" did exist between the theoreticians of "democratic socialism". Some supported the classless society, while others were against the abolition of classes since, in the opinion of one of the advocates of this point of view, W. Theimer, the abolition of classes is not only impossible but also harmful, because it conceals within itself a "tendency towards totalitarianism".²

On careful examination, however, these statements turn out to be fairly similar to each other. The supporters of the first viewpoint treat the classless society as "a society without class privileges, in which the various forces can act together in accordance with the democratic rules of the game".³ This differed only slightly from the statements of those who advocated the second viewpoint that "instead of the class-

¹ A. Walz, *Vom Sozialismus zum Neosozialismus*, S. 223-225.

² W. Theimer, *Der Marxismus*, S. 101.

³ W. Eichler, *Weltanschauung und Politik*, S. 117.

less society the variegated picture begins to form of a society not free from contradictions, but just consisting of all the working elements, a society which must offer everyone social security and the highest possible standard of living".¹

The advocates of both points of view did not support the abolition of private ownership and the setting up of public ownership, but demanded the preservation in the socio-class structure of the future society of "traditional" social groups among which they mentioned the middle and lower strata of office workers and civil servants, tradesmen, craftsmen, the lower and middle bourgeoisie and, in certain circumstances, even monopolists.²

As for the proletariat, there is no mention of it whatsoever, since, according to the theoreticians of "democratic socialism", it either no longer exists or is disappearing, giving way to the "middle strata"³. As evidence of this they quote the improvement in the material and cultural well-being of the working people over the last few decades, changes in the structure of the working class resulting from the scientific and technological revolution, etc., which are interpreted in the spirit of the so-called distributive and organisational theories of classes and other conceptions of social stratification and mobility.

All these theories are based on a distortion of the real processes of the development of the working class and the other social strata in modern capitalist society, for which the process of growing proletarianisation is actually more characteristic on the whole.⁴ On the other hand, they illustrate the anti-worker, anti-socialist nature of the theory of "democratic socialism", which so easily removes from the historical arena the class that has been advanced as the guiding force of socialism by history itself, by the objective requirements of social production. In this respect also the

¹ W. Theimer, *Der Marxismus*, S. 102.

² Ibid.

³ B. Kopp, *Liberalismus und Sozialismus auf dem Weg zur Synthese*, S. 117-118.

⁴ Suffice it to say that the section of the working class belonging to the employed population in West Germany increased by 7 per cent in 1950-1962 alone and was 77.8 per cent in 1962 (*Imperialismus heute. Der staatsmonopolistische Kapitalismus in Westdeutschland*, Berlin, 1965, S. 610), and 80.6 per cent in 1969 (*Imperialismus der BRD*, Berlin, 1971, 5.336).

theory of "democratic socialism" is objectively directed towards perpetuating the existing social and class structure.

The theory which R. Dahrendorf expounds in his book *Gesellschaft und Freiheit (Society and Freedom)*¹ provides an example of the eclectic confusion of Right-wing socialist theoreticians on the question of social-class structure.

The point of departure for Right-wing socialist views on the "democratic socialist" state is rejection of destroying the state machine of modern capitalist society, which they describe as "the people's state based, if not entirely, to a large extent on democracy".²

Evidence of this is the functions which Social Democratic theoreticians consider should be part of the "democratic socialist" state. Thus, H. Deist believes that the main tasks of this state should be, firstly, to promote smooth production and ensure full employment and a steady rise in the standard of living; secondly, to co-ordinate governmental economic policy with the "autonomous" actions of the employers and the activities of the political parties; thirdly, to keep a check on the "economic concentration of power" and take measures to restrict its abuse; fourthly, to achieve a "just distribution of income", etc.³

Let us take a closer look at what all this really means. When Right Social Democrats say that the "democratic socialist" state must promote the smooth development of the national economy, they usually mention planning as one of the appropriate measures. This is immediately followed by the reservation that the planning they have in mind is not the same as that used in the socialist countries, and that it would not have the same universal and normative character. It would be free from "planning fetishism". The Right-wing socialist version of planning should be of a recommendatory nature, as it were, and be used only in case of need, when free competition is incapable of ensuring sufficient growth of the economy. Thus, it acts only as a subsidiary,

¹ R. Dahrendorf, *Gesellschaft und Freiheit*, München, 1961. For an analysis of these views see: L. Andreyev, "Social Witch-Doctoring", *Kommunist*, Moscow, 1966, No. 16, pp. 113-121.

² F. Sängers, *Grundsatzprogramm der SPD. Kommentar*, Berlin-Hannover, 1960, S. 33-36.

³ H. Deist, *Wirtschaft von Morgen*, Berlin-Hannover, 1959, S. 39, 52, 53, 55.

secondary means by comparison with competition, which the majority of the Right-wing socialist theoreticians regard as the decisive driving force of the economy.¹

Such a framing of the question of planning in society differs little from the West German government's practice of using the state budget and the general system of state finances (banking, insurance, etc.) in order to avert crises and ensure the growth of capitalist production.² This is not surprising. Having rejected the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, the Right-wing socialist theoreticians naturally could not go beyond the limits of the capitalist system in the sphere of planning as well. The Right-wing socialist version of planning in the "democratic socialist" state provides for its implementation on the principle—competition if possible, planning only when it is essential and "does not endanger society".³

The pro-capitalist nature of the functions of the "democratic socialist" state is seen particularly clearly in the "public control" system which is intended to "restrain the monopolies" and prevent abuse of the "economic concentration of power". K. Nemitz lists twelve measures for this "public control" system: introduction of a law making it compulsory for companies to publish information about profits, self-financing, etc., registration of lobbyists, regulation of labour, social and other legislation, establishment of a system of "socially connected enterprises", extension of "participation", introduction of legislation governing the activities of monopolies, assistance to the small and middle employers, taxation, financial and credit measures, recommendations in the sphere of price fixing, legislation on accumulation, control of investment and "transfer to public ownership".⁴

First and foremost, it is essential to bear in mind that most of these measures are copied from the ones which have already been used both by the West German state and by certain international state-monopoly associations. For example, in discussing the need for a control of investment, the Right-wing socialist theoreticians state that this control

¹ A. Walz, *Vom Sozialismus zum Neosozialismus*, S. 207-216.

² *Imperialismus heute*, S. 114.

³ B. Kopp, *Liberalismus und Sozialismus auf dem Weg zur Synthese*, S. 116-121.

⁴ K. Nemitz, *op. cit.*, S. 137-138.

must be similar to that which is in force in the European Coal and Steel Community, and "participation" to that which obtains in munitions works.¹ It is equally important to remember that such a radical means of "public control" as "transfer to public ownership", as has been pointed out, is seen as a last resort and is practically reduced to nothing because of its empty, vague definition.

But the main defect of the Right-wing socialist system of "public control" is that its aim is not to abolish the monopolies, but merely to "restrict" them and subordinate them to "public needs". This system does not touch upon the actual essence of capitalist production, but merely attempts to "correct" it, to "improve" it. Its measures are such that they cannot have the slightest serious influence even on private abuses.

The measure aimed against such a shameful practice in modern capitalist society as lobbyism, which is one of the most important channels through which the monopolies influence legislative bodies,² is limited to the registration of lobbyists, i.e., to regulating their activity and, in other words, is of a purely formal character.

Another measure in the proposed "public control" system—the introduction of workers' "participation" in management in the form in which it is envisaged by the Right leaders of German Social Democrats—is aimed basically at binding the workers to the capitalist system and hampering the development of their class consciousness. The Bad Godesberg Programme and the writings of the Right-wing socialist theoreticians examine "participation" only as the best method of "social partnership", and in fact reproduce the same ideas as were incorporated in the 1952 law on production councils at capitalist enterprises.

Another measure quite incapable of "restraining the monopolies" is the method, proposed by the theoreticians of "democratic socialism", of creating various types of enterprises, particularly co-operative and "economic trade union enterprises", forming a sector of so-called free social economy. It is true that by comparison with monopolistic enterprises they are to a certain extent more democratic, because they

¹ K. Nemitz, op. cit., S. 137-137.

² *Imperialismus heute*, S. 184-192.

remove the worker from the sphere of the direct influence of monopoly capital. There can be no doubt that, in advancing this proposal, the Right-wing socialist theoreticians had in mind the experience of certain enterprises in West Germany, such as those under the jurisdiction of the Association of German Trade Unions, which is dominated by the Social Democrats. They were set up on trade union funds and are subject to trade union administration. The labour conditions there are, of course, more democratic than at other enterprises. They include the Bank für Gemeinschaft AG, which controls more than twenty West German and foreign enterprises, the Alte Volksfürsorge, and the Hamburg Deutscher Konsumgenossenschaften.¹

Promoting such enterprises, however, cannot be an adequate method of restraining the monopolies, and certainly not of attaining socialism. Firstly, the monopolies not only surpass them economically, but also make broad use of the power of the state in their own interests, whose measures are for the most part directed against the small and middle enterprises, and cooperatives. The power of the cooperative enterprises and enterprises belonging to the sector of "free public economy" is too unequal compared with that of the monopolies. Secondly, under the total predominance of the capitalist mode of production these enterprises cannot go beyond the framework of capitalist relations. In his article "On Co-operation" Lenin noted that "in the capitalist state, co-operatives are ... collective capitalist institutions", although "under private capitalism co-operative enterprises differ from capitalist enterprises"². Consequently hopes that the working people may come to socialism through cooperatives are vain ones; to quote Lenin, this idea contains a great deal of fantasy and romanticism.

Nor can the creation of state enterprises provide a counter-balance to the monopolies and a means of attaining socialism. No matter how much their creation promotes a certain improvement in the position of the working people, it is not the same as the development of socialism. In the modern state-monopoly system, the combination of the economic

¹ *Die westdeutschen Gewerkschaften und das staatsmonopolistische Herrschaftssystem, 1945-1966*, Berlin, 1968, S. 184-190.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 472-473.

power of the monopolies with the political power of the state has frequently found expression in the creation of such state enterprises.

In short, the idea of the "diversity of types of enterprises" in the "democratic socialist" society is actually an unsocialist one, since all the types of enterprises proposed are either variations of capitalist enterprises, or powerless formations which in the last analysis are also organically enmeshed in the capitalist system.

The Right-wing socialist theoreticians consider the "fair" distribution of incomes, property, etc., to be an important function of the "democratic socialist" state. The Bad Godesberg Programme, the official documents of the leadership of the SPD and the works of its theoreticians contain frequent verbal criticism of the existing "income structure" in capitalist society and proposals for changing it.¹ How? The Bad Godesberg Programme reads: "The Social Democratic Party wishes to create conditions of life, under which all people could set up their own property from a rising income on a free decision. This implies the constant rise in the social product with its fair distribution."²

The main method proposed for carrying all this out is the "broad dispersion" of part of the profit of large enterprises, which is to take place with the "help of market methods" and must on no account be in the nature of "confiscatory measures", i.e., must not damage the property of the monopolies. In the years immediately following the acceptance of the Bad Godesberg Programme the West German Social Democrats persistently preached these and other ideas of so-called people's capitalism which were being spread by the Christian Democratic Union. The only difference was that whereas the Christian Democrats proposed selling the workers shares in return for their own savings, the Right Social Democratic leaders suggested setting up, by means of transferring part of the profits of large enterprises to the state, a national fund which would buy shares for the workers. It was stressed that shareholders would not have the right to sell them freely.

Obviously such social democratic ways of ensuring "just

¹ *Das Grundsatzprogramm der SPD*, S. 26.

² *Vorwärts*, 1960, December 23, S. 12.

distribution" of income are not only illusory, but also void of all socialist content. Independently of subjective desires they create false illusions that the antagonistic class differences in modern capitalist society can be overcome without the abolition of social relations, simply by quantitative changes in income. On the other hand, these means are in fact a method of obtaining additional capital investment for the monopolies, and also of instilling and consolidating the petty-bourgeois psychology in the consciousness of the workers, binding them more closely to the existing system.

With regard to the proposed political form of the "democratic socialist" state, it must be pointed out that this copies in many respects existing political structures in modern developed capitalist countries or reproduces certain elements of foreign political standards.

Describing the "free state" of the "democratic socialist" society Right-wing socialist theoreticians spoke of three main principles in its organisation as a democratic political system. First and foremost, they referred to the principle of the division of powers, which would make it possible to introduce the power of an "anonymous force", as the monopolies were tactfully called, within reasonable limits and to avoid turning the state into "a ball for one party to play with", and also to organise the work of civil servants in accordance with moral laws. In fact, however, the concept of the division of powers was treated as the division of labour to preserve the existing socio-political order between the ruling parties of the CDU/CSU and the SPD like the two-party system in the United States.¹ They talked about the need to develop the self-government of communities which were called a "school of democracy", about preserving the federal system, and urged that the "parties be irreproachably democratic in their structure and internal order", but not a word was said about the need for abolishing the power of the monopolies in the economy and in the state.

Even more transparent in this sense was the content of the second principle. Its aim was integration, i.e., the fullest

¹ F. Sanger, *Grundsatzprogramm der SPD. Kommentar*, S. 36-37.

subordination of members of society to the existing state monopoly order, in which the Right Social Democrats are also ready to play an active part.

As for the third principle—the so-called democracy capable of defending itself—this was openly anti-communist and anti-popular.

The Right-wing socialist theoreticians devoted a great deal of attention also to those organisations which it is assumed will be an element in the future political structure of “democratic socialism” on the basis of “de-ideologisation”. Among these organisations the church is to occupy an important position. In the Bad Godesberg Programme, for example, there is no mention of separating church and state. On the contrary, it is emphasised that the Social Democratic Party “recognises the special purpose” of the church and religious societies. The reason for this, as one of the compilers of this programme, F. Sängner, points out, is that the Social Democrats and the church share a common principle: both proceed from the fact that the stimulus for human activity lies in religious striving.¹

The similarity between the West German version of “democratic socialism” and Catholic social doctrine can be seen from a collection of articles by well-known Catholic sociologists bearing the title *What Is Socialism Today?*²

It concentrates attention primarily on the conception of the West German Right Social Democrats, an analysis of which is given in the articles by G. Gundlach, F. Kleber and O. von Nell-Breuning. Comparing West German “democratic socialism” with Catholic social doctrine, and in particular with the encyclic of Pope Pius XI *Quadragesimo anno*, in which the Catholic Church openly condemned Marxist socialism, these authors unanimously reach the conclusion that is formulated most fully by F. Kleber: “The result of our analysis of the Bad Godesberg Programme enables us to conclude that the socialism, which is based on the principles of this programme, cannot be identified with the socialism analysed in the encyclic *Quadragesimo anno*, and therefore not only does it not call for condemnation,

¹ F. Sängner, op. cit., S. 94-95.

² *Was ist Sozialismus heute?*, Köln, 1966.

but corresponds to the principles of Catholic social doctrine."¹

In their articles these Catholic theoreticians show that the Bad Godesberg Programme, including its methodological principles, has much in common with Catholic social teaching.

Thus, the Right Social Democrats attempt to present their futurological ideal in the form of a "third path" for mankind by comparison with modern capitalism and socialism, as a social system the characteristic feature of which is to be the "combination" of individual elements of both systems.

This conception is a speculative construction directed against the Marxist-Leninist theory of social development, the Marxist method of scientific prediction.

With regard to the reforms proposed by the Right Social Democrats, they are, of course, totally inadequate for establishing a new social system because they do not deal with the main point—capitalist production relations and the political power of the class of the bourgeoisie—and leave untouched the capitalist mode of production, on which capitalist exploitation, the economic and political rule of the bourgeoisie, are based. Moreover, the system of "public control" is aimed primarily at "mending holes", at propping up a system doomed to inevitable collapse.

The "socialist market economy", the "pluralist" socio-class structure and the "mixed" political system of "democratic socialism", as has been shown, do not contain a grain of socialism and are very close to state monopoly conceptions. The Right Social Democrats talk about socialism merely in order to give their proposed system an "elevated socialist meaning" and thus to implant illusions in the consciousness of the masses. The futurological conception of the West German Right Social Democrats in the form in which it was set out in the Bad Godesberg Programme and the writings of its theoreticians is, therefore, a combination of utopian anti-capitalism and real anti-communism.

Naturally, this conception, however attractively it was presented by the Right Social Democrats, could not avoid

¹ Ibid., Köln, 1966, S. 82.

sharing the fate of all similar petty-bourgeois futurological theories and was bound sooner or later to come up against the inevitable dilemma of our time—capitalism or socialism. Let us see in which direction this conception is developing in our days.

* * *

After accepting "democratic socialism" as its programmatic aim the futurological conception of the West German Right-wing Social Democrats continued essentially to draw closer, on domestic political questions, to the conceptions of state-monopoly circles, on the one hand, and to depart from those democratic elements which still remained in the West German version of "democratic socialism", on the other.

As D. Klink has shown in his book, the West German Right Social Democrats, for example, after the Bad Godesberg Congress in 1959, basing themselves on the "conception of the unity of different social forces in the pluralist society", increasingly went over to a common standpoint with the ruling circles of the CDU/CSU.¹

In a certain sense the book *Deutschland 1975* written by Social Democrats bears witness to this process. It is a futile attempt to give an analytical prediction of the development of Germany in the relatively near future, and also to define the political methods and means of attaining the aims in question. "It is important for the politician to be able to evaluate the long-term effective tendencies which will determine our society up to and beyond 1975. He must know which instruments the scientists possess and can offer for the accomplishment of large domestic social tasks."²

This book reflects the increasing transition of Right Social Democrats from the extreme voluntaristic and ethical argument to the "technicist" one. Germany's development is determined here through an analysis of ten-

¹ D. Klink, *Vom Antikapitalismus zur sozialistischen Marktwirtschaft*, Hannover, 1965, S. 135-136, 140-141.

² *Deutschland 1975. Analyse. Prognose. Perspektive*, München, 1965, S. 5-6.

dencies in the sphere of population growth, technology, industry, etc. From this the authors proceed to recommendations in the sphere of education, social security, public utilities, etc., in other words, in the methodological respect they proceed from the material-technical conditions of the life of society, and not from abstract anthropological, ethical standards as was frequently the case before.

However this "technicist" substantiation of the prospects for the country is also extremely one-sided. The authors ignore the socio-class contrast between the FRG, on the one hand, and the GDR, on the other. Describing the GDR's economic development in their usual prejudiced way, they will not or cannot understand that the FRG and GDR belong to different socio-economic systems. Although the book is called *Deutschland 1975*, the authors base their analysis of social trends and their examination of domestic tasks almost exclusively on West German material.

They are incapable of providing a scientific forecast of the development of the two essentially different states. In dealing with such questions as the development of civil rights, the growth of the social product, technology, urban and transport planning, health, social insurance, etc., they attempt to solve them from the standpoint of "pluralistic determinism"—a theory that rejects the decisive role of economic relations—which inevitably leads to the mechanical combination of a huge number of empirical facts. There are only a handful of fleeting references to the need for parliamentary reform, the introduction of "participation", restricting the power of the monopolies, ridding the state machine of militarist, revanchist and ultra-reactionary elements, democratic reorganisation of the education system, etc. In individual articles, of course, one finds critical remarks which usually take the form of simple statements of fact.

With regard to the evaluation of the economic and political system in the FRG, the Social Democratic book gives one to understand that this system is a logical and natural one. Germany will be a society of social orientation and democratic planning", in which the state "as a matter of principle must trust the market mechanism".¹ In the enterprises a new production hierarchy will appear,

¹ *Deutschland 1975*, S. 16, 52, 239.

characterised by the fact that the workers, as the role of "scientific leadership" increases, will turn into "colleagues" who are more or less independent of the employer, since the latter will himself depend on them due to the growing complexity of production and will, therefore, be forced to reckon with them.¹ There is not a word about socialism, the abolition of monopolies, capitalist production relations and the political power of the monopolistic circles.

Thus, this publication does not contain either a socialist or a democratic alternative to the state-monopoly system. The futurological conception of "democratic socialism" here has not received any positive development whatsoever.

But the fullest expression of the convergence of the futurological views of West German Right Social Democrats and the socio-political ideals of West German monopolistic circles is to be found in the theory of the "open, or mature, society". The new Social Democratic theory accepted at their Dortmund congress (1966) outwardly appeared as an alternative to the theory of the "formed society", advanced by the CDU in the spring of 1965.

The latter reflected the modern stage of the West German system of state-monopoly capitalism, a system which is striving, by means of rigorous control within and outside the country, to "form" not only German, but human society in general.

The CDU theory is anti-humanist, anti-democratic and totalitarian. According to it not only the working class but also other social strata are to be turned into screws in the state-monopoly social and production machine without the right to take part in solving the basic problems, by instilling in them a purely consumer, passive, conformist attitude towards life. The ideal preached is a wild craze for entertainment, withdrawal into private life, in other words, a primitivisation and narrowing of the interests of the individual, the rejection of an active attitude towards life and of the struggle to change the existing order, etc.

As well as the West German Communists who immediately exposed the true essence of the theory of the "formed society", even a few West German thinkers who have not shown any particular realism in their approach to socio-political

¹ *Deutschland 1974*, S. 63-65.

questions (Karl Jaspers, for example), and still adopt an anti-communist standpoint today, refuse to accept the conception of the "formed society" and to reconcile themselves to the order imposed in accordance with it.

At the Social Democratic Party Congress in Dortmund (1966) the theory of the "formed society" was called a "vague formula" concealing an attempt "to conserve the social status quo and protect traditional interests", and the theory of the "open, or mature, society" was advanced as a counterbalance.¹ The content of these two theories turned out to be quite similar, however.

The Social Democratic theory originates in Karl Popper's conception of the same name, which was expounded by him as far back as 1945 in *The Open Society and Its Enemies*.

The Right Social Democrats proceed from the fact that the present state-monopoly system in the country is natural and eternal. "Our modern society is pluralist," the theoreticians of the "open, or mature, society" announced at the Congress. "And it will remain so in the future."² Their new theory does not even contain the antimonomopolistic declarations that were in the Bad Godesberg Programme. The theoreticians of the "open, or mature, society" see it as their main aim not to oppose the striving of reactionary circles to "form" West German society, but to "adapt the state and society to the conditions of a constantly growing industrial society", not to allow revolutionary upheavals and to overcome the rift between the economic potential of the FRG and its political role in the modern world.³

The speeches of Right Social Democratic theoreticians no longer mention "public control", which the Social Democrats regarded earlier as a "means of curbing the power of the monopolies". What is more, a resolution was passed at the Congress urging the SPD not to interfere with the activities of the employers, and to keep their property intact.

The Right Social Democrats have also retreated on the question of introducing "participation" as an "organic element" of the "open, or mature, society". But unlike before, when "participation" was regarded as an urgent task in the

¹ *Vorwärts*, June 8, 1966, S. 11, 15, 19.

² *Ibid.*, S. 15.

³ *Ibid.*, S. 19.

"struggle for a fair share in social labour and the right to economic and social self-determination", the new theory proposes that the question of "participation" be studied again in committees with the participation of employers. In addition, the Right Social Democrats succeeded in passing a resolution approving the extraordinary legislation, thereby paving the way to a large extent for the acceptance in the country of this legislation, which is one of the bases of the "formed society".

Acceptance of the theory of the "open, or mature, society" by West German Right Democrats produced a negative reaction from a number of Social Democratic organisations and many other democratically and realistically minded West Germans. In this connection the leadership of the SPD attempted to dissociate itself from the theory and practice of reactionary West German circles.

The draft *Sozialdemokratische Perspektiven im Übergang zu den siebziger Jahren*¹ says a great deal about measures for "mastering the future", but basically its ideas are merely a repetition—and in an abbreviated form—of what was written in the Bad Godesberg Programme and also in the resolutions of the Karlsruhe and, more particularly, the Dortmund congresses, following which the leaders of the West German Social Democrats made the SPD adopt a position which has little in common not only with socialism (the draft, incidentally, does not even contain the term), but also with democracy. The draft lacks the most important point—the real striving to ensure the decisive influence of the working masses on the fate of society and to overthrow the power of the monopolies in the country, without which, it is impossible to achieve either democratic or socialist transformation of society. The draft does not contain any demand to change the socio-political structure of West Germany, nor is there any mention of the extraordinary legislation, nationalisation, or measures to check the growth of revanchist and neo-nazi forces, etc.

The assurances given by the SPD leadership to the delegates of the Nuremberg Congress (March 1968) of loyalty to the principles of "democratic socialism" were nullified

¹ *Vorwärts*, January 11, 1968, S. 9-11.

by the fact that the theory of the "open, or mature, society" and the policy of the "large coalition" were recognised as correct by the Congress (albeit by a small majority).

Shortly afterwards the Social Democratic organisations were offered a second, amended draft of the *Sozialdemokratische Perspektiven*. The content of the amendments was yet further confirmation of the rejection by the West German Right Social Democrats of even the ideas of "democratic socialism". The second draft, which was more strongly anti-communist, did not contain any criticism of the CDU as a "conservative force" or any reference to the growth of neo-nazi forces in the country. There was not a single word about the glaring contradiction between the principles of the West German constitution and reality; the results of the post-war development of the country were described as follows: "The overall standards of living and social security have surpassed all the previous historical achievements of our people. The working parliamentary democracy is stable and vital for the first time. The value ... of the individual person is becoming the measure of life." The draft contained a more precisely formulated positive evaluation of state-monopoly tendencies in the country and a refusal to treat "public control" as a means of "curbing" the monopolies.

The most important economic task in the near future, said the amended draft, should be "adapting the socio-political activity and the policy of consumption and promotion of competition to the consequences of concentration".¹

The extraordinary congress of the SPD, held in Bad Godesberg in 1969, sanctioned the ideas of the draft *Sozialdemokratische Perspektiven* and, hence, the evolution of the Social Democratic leaders over the preceding decade.²

In subsequent years the social ideal of the West German right-wing Social Democrats has not undergone any substantial changes. As can be seen from an analysis of the decisions of the SPD congresses at Saarbrücken in 1970, Bonn and Bad Godesberg in 1971, and Dortmund in 1972, and particularly the "Draft Preliminary Economic and Political Prospects for 1973-1985", the right wing of the Social Democ-

¹ *Andere Zeitung*, August 22, 1968.

² *Vorwärts*, April 24, 1969.

rats continues to preach the ideas of bourgeois ideologists, and to stand as before for the so-called system of market economy and the preservation of the capitalist economy and the system of state monopoly capitalism. Their proposed reforms are "in fact subject to the interests of the monopolies",¹ designed to "deprive revolutionary ideology of soil on which to feed", and to "avoid the sort of domestic political situation which exists in Italy or France".² In this sense the Hannover Congress of the SPD held in April 1973 was no exception. Although a great deal was said at the Congress about "democratic socialism" and loyalty to the democratic values of the Godesberg programme, and the "Draft Preliminary Economic and Political Prospects" were not approved, the Congress passed a number of resolutions on domestic political problems which, in the opinion of West German Communists and some non-communist press organs, were aimed at improving and humanising the present, i.e., capitalist, system and defending the existing social and political relations.³

At the same time it must be noted that since the SPD became the leading party in the coalition government in 1969 some positive changes have taken place in the foreign policy of the West German Social Democrats. Treaties with the Soviet Union and Poland have been concluded and come into force, and a treaty has been signed with the GDR. The attitude of the Social Democrats on a broad range of international questions shows realism and the desire for the Federal Republic of Germany to play an active part in solving important problems of ensuring peace and cooperation in Europe. The Hannover Congress of 1973 consolidated and developed this realistic course. Further improvement of relations between the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union and other socialist countries remains, as stated in a Congress resolution, one of the most important principles of SPD foreign policy. The Congress supported the principles of peaceful coexistence and the convocation

¹ This, in any case, is how one of the leaders of the "new socialists", K. Voigt, assesses the Draft (*Vorwärts*, January 23, 1973, S. 2).

² See: *Marxistische Blätter*, N. 5, 1972, S. 80-84; *Einheit* N. 1, 1973, S. 92-94; *Die neue Gesellschaft* N. 10, 1972.

³ See: *Unsere Zeit*, April 19; May 1, 1973; *Konkret* N. 16.

of a European Conference on Security and Cooperation. It welcomed the conclusion of the agreement to end the war and reestablish peace in Vietnam, and the holding of talks to reduce armed forces and arms in Europe. These positive elements were confirmed and developed during the visit of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev, to the Federal Republic of Germany in May 1973.

* * *

This crisis in the futurological ideas of "democratic socialism" can be also seen to a certain extent in the Social Democratic parties of other countries. Evidence of this is the switch to the Right which has taken place in recent years under the flag of so-called "re-ideologisation" in the theory and practice of the leaders of the Austrian Socialist Party which for a long time prided itself on its tolerance of various tendencies, including Marxism, and on its devotion to the socialist ideals. The Austrian Right Socialist leaders have openly gone over to an anti-communist position, which they regard as a compulsory principle of their theoretical and practical activity. There is growing dispute among the ranks of the Austrian Socialists about their ultimate aim. Proposals are being made to renounce the socialist name of the party and socialism itself. The Right Social Democratic leaders in Austria and certain other European countries are in fact subordinating the working-class movement to the interests of monopoly capital and undermining the cause of the working people's struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

At the same time, however, it would be quite wrong to conclude the absence of any opposition within the ranks of the Social Democrats. Under the influence of a number of factors in socio-political world development (the great achievements of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and of the world communist, working-class and national liberation movements, the growth of democratic forces in the leading imperialist countries, economic instability which disproves neo-capitalist illusions, and, finally, the actual evolution of the theory and practice of the Right-wing Socialist leaders), desire is growing among Social Democrats to do away with the supremacy of the Right wing

in their parties, free themselves from anti-communism and join forces with the Communists and other fighters for peace, democracy and socialism.

Confirmation of this are the processes developing at the present time in many parties of the Socialist International. Socialist and Social-Democratic party leaders in certain countries in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, in spite of ideological divergences, including disagreement on problems of the future, have drawn closer to the Communists on a number of practical questions. In following this path their parties have already achieved some definite success in winning over the working masses and have managed to set up coalition or single-party governments (Finland, Chile, and others) which are pursuing positive domestic and foreign policies. What is more, some Social Democratic leaders whose own experience has convinced them that Communists, who initiate cooperation with Social Democrats are guided by the vital interests of the working-class movement and the working masses, are demanding the renunciation of anti-communism on a world-wide scale.

It was under the influence of this trend that the Bureau of the Socialist International was forced in April 1972 to pass a resolution on relations with the Communists, according to which Socialist parties are free to decide for themselves the question of bilateral relations with Communist parties, and at the Vienna Congress of the Socialist International in 1972 the representatives of the Finnish Social Democrats and the French Socialists demanded the abandonment of a "fruitless negative position" with regard to socialist countries and the Communists.

However, this process in the Social Democratic movement, the growth of opposition to the theory and practice of Right-wing Social Democratic leaders, is uneven and not always connected with overcoming anti-communist prejudices and extreme adventurism. The turning towards a serious and businesslike dialogue is, so far, characteristic of a few individual parties, and not of the Social Democratic movement as a whole. But the profound differentiation which is growing inside modern Social Democracy and to which attention was paid during the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow, the growth of discontent

with right-wing forces, and the striving of more and more Social Democrats to have done with anti-communism give grounds for hope that this trend will develop and strengthen, and that the Social Democratic movement will embark on the path of peace and progress.

Chapter 7

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST NATURE OF IDEAS OF SOCIAL PROGRESS IN BOURGEOIS FUTUROLOGY AND THE STAGES OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND "EVOLUTION" THEORIES

The modern bourgeois theories which take as their object of analysis the prospects for social development as a whole turn increasingly frequently to the future of socialism.

Modern bourgeois thought today cannot confine itself to crude, primitive lies concerning the present and future of the new world.

Restricting itself to a negative evaluation of socialism and denying its achievements has become simply impossible, but to admit its successes would be tantamount to total ideological capitulation, which the bourgeoisie of imperialist states cannot permit itself. Therefore, in the late fifties and particularly in the sixties some bourgeois sociologists attempted to say how the two worlds would develop in the future and what would be the outcome of the contest between capitalism and socialism. These theories could only be theories of social regress, for bourgeois social thought could not allow of any other prospect except the restoration of capitalism in the socialist community. Certain interesting features are embodied in these theories of social regress, however, which reflect the present stage of the struggle between the two systems and the position of imperialism in the modern world.

First, they all claim to be theories of progress, not regress — bourgeois thinkers want to adapt themselves to developing reality; secondly, the aggressive, misanthropic face of imperialism is masked by peace-loving and liberal phraseology; thirdly, the authors of these theories recognise, either directly or indirectly, the achievements of socialism. In the interests of the struggle against the growing superiority of the socialist system, however, they attribute these suc-

cesses and attainments not to the natural development of socialism, but to the influence of capitalism. Moreover, and this is most important, all these theories try to prove that in the future socialism is bound to take the road of capitalism, thereby creating the ideological foundation for subversive political activity against socialism. Such theories include the following: the theory of "the stages of economic growth", the convergence theory (in all its various forms) and, finally, the "evolution" theory, which has been developed in great detail in a number of books and articles by the American political ideologist Z. Brzezinski. Very closely connected with these theories are those of the "post-industrial society" and "de-ideologisation" which have recently become widespread in the West.

All these theories differ from one another in argumentation, in their basic premises, and in their content, but they are united by: 1) their reactionary anti-communist essence; 2) attempts to create an alternative to the Marxist-Leninist theory of social development; and 3) their proximity to reformism and revisionism on a number of important questions. Therefore, although each of the theories listed above does so differently, they are all aiming at the same point, trying to prove that the socialist countries are advancing towards capitalism and that they will undergo radical changes in their economic and socio-political system. These changes are depicted as being progressive and are presented under the plea of concern for "true democracy".

This new ideological line of modern anti-communism undoubtedly represents a definite turning from primitive anti-communism, which called for and occasionally continues to call for a crusade against the socialist countries as part of the struggle against the "communist conspiracy" and "communist aggression". The supporters of this new anti-communist ideological line have no objection to posing as well-wishers, friends of the peoples of the socialist countries, "defenders" of their interests. Soviet specialists have produced a detailed analysis of some of these theories.¹

¹ V. S. Kapyrin, *The Process of Social Development and the "Theory of Stages"* of Walt Rostow, Moscow, 1967 (in Russian); G. P. Davidyuk, *A Critique of the Theory of the "Single Industrial Society"*, Minsk, 1968 (in Russian), and others.

Let us examine their anti-communist nature and consider the attempts of their authors to prove by sociological argument that socialism is doomed to "wither away" (Walt Rostow's theory of the "stages of economic growth"), and also that the progressive development in the political organisation of socialist society is the emergence in the socialist countries of "pluralist" democracy of the Western (bourgeois) pattern.

In an examination of these questions the following problems must be placed in the foreground: 1) what is the scientific "criterion of progress" from which Rostow proceeds in foretelling the collapse of socialism; 2) what can one regard as the criterion of democracy in a society.

* * *

Let us turn firstly to the problem of the progressive nature of a social system. According to Rostow's theory of the "stages of economic growth", the Soviet Union has reached the fourth, and the United States the fifth stage, and consequently the Soviet Union is to evolve towards a society of "mass consumption" which the United States has already reached. "In its essence communism is likely to wither in the age of high mass-consumption,"¹ states Rostow. We shall not deal here with the question of whether the United States can be considered a society of mass consumption. This question has been treated exhaustively by many writers, including American ones, who have noted that Rostow totally ignores the reality of American society and concentrates on making an apology for American capitalism. Let us pose the theoretical question: what criterion does the author of the "stages of economic growth" have in mind for the progressive nature of social development? We find that he offers a one-sided technical-economic criterion of a purely quantitative order. For him the criterion of social progress is the sum total of certain technical and economic data as, for example, the level of capital investment as a percentage of national income, the size of capital investment and capital per head of the population, the level of technological development, the character and number of the leading sectors of the econ-

¹ W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth. A Non-Communist Manifesto*, p. 133.

omy inherent in the given "stage of growth", the amount of manufactured goods per head of the population, etc. This criterion of progress ignores rates of growth, the real position of the working masses, the distribution and sources of income, and the system of production relations.

Turning to real social development, one sees that the Soviet Union is firmly retaining its supremacy in growth rates over the capitalist world. High and stable growth rates in industrial production are a regular feature of Soviet economic development and an important advantage of socialism. During the period of 1966-1970 the annual growth of the industrial product in the USSR was equal to an average of 8.5 per cent, compared to 3.3 per cent for the United States. Between 1961 and 1970 Soviet industrial output increased at an average annual rate of 8.5 per cent, whereas the corresponding figure for the United States was 4.5 per cent, almost half.¹

The problem of growth rates is one that commands the attention of both economists and monopolists in the United States. According to the estimates of well-informed experts it is unlikely that the annual growth rate in the USA even in the region of 5 per cent could be expected during the near future. Socialism is striding ahead more quickly than capitalism and this is undoubtedly an important indication of the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Another most important indication of the progressive nature of a social system is the rise in the general level of education. In the period 1914/15 to 1970/71 the number of pupils in Soviet general education schools has risen from 9,700,000 to 49,400,000; in secondary specialised educational establishments from 50,300 to 4,400,000; and in higher educational establishments from 130,000 to 4,600,000. The number of books published has risen from 99.2 million to 1,362 million copies between 1913 and 1970 and the number of research workers from 11,600 to 927,700 between 1913 and 1970.

Can it reasonably be objected that these are isolated examples? And what about the sociological criterion of social progress?

In its theory of social progress Marxism-Leninism proceeds from a scientific approach to the social process, dealing

¹ *Sotsialisticheskaya industriya*, Moscow, June 10, 1971, p. 3.

with each socio-economic formation as an integral social organism which includes a definite mode of producing material wealth (that is, productive forces and the corresponding production relations). Production relations form the economic basis of society and also determine its political and ideological superstructure.

The progressive nature of socio-economic formations can be described in scientific terms only by making a comparative analysis of them as integral systems.

Marxists regard the development of productive forces as the main and supreme criterion of progress.¹ This definition, however, requires a certain amount of explanation. Firstly, it should be borne in mind that the main element in the scientific concept of productive forces is the working people.² Therefore, the role of the working people in society, their position in society, the degree to which they control not only the forces of nature, but also social relations is an inalienable element in the criterion of social progress. Lenin stressed that "...the proletariat represents and creates a higher type of social organisation of labour compared with capitalism. This is what is important, this is the source of the strength and the guarantee that the final triumph of communism is inevitable."³

The system of production relations, including first and foremost the forms of ownership of the means of production, the relations between people during the production process and the forms of distributing material wealth, in its turn influences the character and development rates of productive forces and this explains why communism represents "the higher productivity of labour—compared with that existing under capitalism—of voluntary, class-conscious and united workers employing advanced techniques."⁴ Socialism is only the first step towards the communist organisation of social work.⁵ Lenin linked the consolidation of socialism with a new organisation of labour combining "the last word in science and capitalist technology with the mass association of

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, pp. 243-44.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 364.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 427.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 420.

class-conscious workers creating large-scale socialist industry."¹

Secondly, although, according to the materialist interpretation of history, production is a decisive element in the final analysis, it is by no means the only decisive element.² The character of the political superstructure, the social activity of the working people, the content of social consciousness—in a word, everything that distinguishes the social organism in its integral whole and inter-relation must be taken into account in defining the degree of progressiveness of social development.

In the Soviet Union, in spite of all the difficulties in its historical development (a comparatively low initial level of development of productive forces and the destruction wrought by the military intervention, the Nazi invasion), there exist such real indices as:

- 1) the absence of exploitation of man by man;
- 2) planned, crisis-free economic development;
- 3) high rates of economic growth exceeding the American ones;
- 4) systematic raising of the material well-being and education of all members of society;
- 5) true popular sovereignty;
- 6) the growth of the creative activity of millions, the decisive participation of the working people in socio-political life and in the organisation of people's economic activity in both town and country for the benefit of building socialism; the mass movement of inventors and rationalisers, amateur talent activities, etc.;
- 7) abolition of all traces of social and national oppression;
- 8) granting of real equality to women;
- 9) flowering of science and culture.

These and other concrete indices are irrefutable proof of the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Evidently we should regard as the scientific criterion of social progress a complex, many-sided criterion which includes the following possibilities created by the given mode of production, the given historical type of organisation of social labour and, above all, the given system of production relations:

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 423.

² K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1955, p. 498.

1) increasing labour productivity and improving the nature of social production forces;

2) developing and using the capabilities and satisfying the material and spiritual needs of the working people themselves;

3) understanding and using for the good of the working people the objective laws of development in both nature and society;

4) increasingly broad participation of the working people in the management of social affairs;

5) the flowering of science, culture and the arts;

6) creating truly human, highly moral relations between peoples and nations, total abolition of all forms and traces of social oppression and social inequality.

The basic relations which bind a social formation into a single whole and determine the qualitative type of the whole social organism—economic production relations—also play a decisive role in the criterion of social progress. Karl Marx wrote that the “*relations of production in their totality constitute what are called the social relations, society, and, specifically, a society at a definite stage of historical development, a society with a peculiar, distinctive character*”.¹

As the basis of the social organism, the production relations create the real, objective possibility for this or that nature and rates of development of productive forces, which also serves as the main criterion of social progress. The index of social progress—the development of productive forces—is not one-sided, narrow and quantitative in character, but possesses both quantitative (rates of development) and qualitative (nature of productive forces) elements. This is understandable. Such a change in the social basis as, for example, socialisation of the means of production, turning them into the property of the whole people, creates real possibilities for effecting a planned, crisis-free development of productive forces, makes the working people led by the working class the guiding force of society, and ensures the realisation of their creative potential.

Naturally, all this does not come about automatically, but in the interaction of all elements of the social organism.

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1969, p. 160.

The creation of a new socialist basis is inconceivable without a socialist revolution under the leadership of the party of the working class and its Communist party (the forms and ways of revolution may vary), without the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, the essence of which is the dictatorship of the proletariat (the forms of the latter depend on concrete historical conditions).

Nor does the progressive transformation of the whole social organism take place automatically. The mechanism of this transformation is embodied in the system of interaction between the basis and the superstructure, this interaction being based on the combination of the objective conditions and laws of social development with the creative energy and initiative of the masses, political parties, organisations and personalities. Under socialism this union is brought about consciously through the agency of Party leadership (since the real objective material prerequisites exist). The role of the subjective factor is increasingly raised in society.

World history has never been an automatic process smoothly proceeding along an ascending line. "...It is undialectical, unscientific and theoretically wrong to regard the course of world history as smooth and always in a forward direction, without occasional gigantic leaps back,"¹ wrote Lenin. The existence of contradictions under socialism (although these contradictions are of a radically different, non-antagonistic nature), and delay in their discovery and eradication also influence the real history of the new socialist world.

Marxism-Leninism has nothing in common with fatalism. Knowledge of the objective laws of social development and understanding of the existing inter-relation between the basis and the superstructure, and of the living dialectic of the objective and the subjective, opens up the most extensive possibilities for creative historical activity by people, political parties and the masses, which also has a decisive influence on the progressive nature of the new socialist system. To our mind, the criterion of the progressive nature of a social system would be incomplete if it did not reveal

V. I. Lenin, *Collected, Works*, Vol. 22, p. 310.

all the riches of socio-economic formations as real stages of social development.

This detailed criterion of social progress also facilitates the examination of various types of social progress which differ from one another depending on whether social development takes place on the basis of antagonistic exploitative societies or on new socialist social relations. Under socialism progress loses its antagonistic nature. "*Only* socialism will be the beginning of a rapid, genuine, truly mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population, in all spheres of public and private life,"¹ wrote Lenin.

In his speech at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the USA, Gus Hall, spoke convincingly of the tremendous historical significance of socialist progress, and the need to take into account not only quantitative, but also qualitative indices in comparing capitalism and socialism. He said: "In the minds of millions, in the capitalist world, there is growing a new criterion by which they measure and compare the two world systems.

"The comparisons are not now limited to industrial charts or prices of goods.

"What is placed on the scales now is the overall quality of life. Standards of physical comforts remain very important in determining the quality of life, but the yardstick is much broader now. It includes the total spectrum of human values, the order of priorities, dictated by the inherent laws of each system. It includes the moral, cultural and philosophical concepts nurtured by each system. Many of the new components that add up to a quality of life cannot be measured by charts.

"How can you weigh the growing sense of insecurity, alienation and frustration of not being involved, not being a factor, under capitalism with that of being totally involved and relevant, of being able to determine the course of life that flows from the inner nature of socialism.

"How can one compare by charts the quality of life, of distortions, humiliations, the brutal suffering and pain that is the product of racism, fostered by capitalism, with the

¹ Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 472.

flowering of a quality of life under socialism, a life without racism, based on equality and dignity of each individual."¹

An objective comparative analysis of socialist and capitalist societies based on the detailed scientific criterion of social progress provides convincing confirmation, firstly, of the indisputable superiority of socialism over capitalism and, secondly, that the Rostow's forecasts about the impending "withering" of socialism are unfounded and utopian.

The question of the criterion for the democratic nature of a society is a serious theoretical problem deserving considerable attention in the light of the present struggle between the forces of imperialist reaction and social progress.

"It is a well-known fact that questions of democracy are today at the centre of the ideological and political struggle between the socialist world and the capitalist world," stressed L. I. Brezhnev in the Party Central Committee Report to the 24th CPSU Congress. "Bourgeois ideologists and revisionists are hypocritically lamenting that we have no democracy. They are offering us all sorts of 'advice' about 'improving' socialism, 'democratising it.'"²

For a long time, and to a certain extent today also, reactionary ideologists reiterate the need for the "democratisation" of socialism, spreading slander about its "totalitarian" nature. In so doing they usually refer to six basic features of the "totalitarian regime": a common ideology; a single party; a terroristic police; a communications monopoly; a weapons monopoly; and a centrally directed economy.³ This list alone is sufficient to reveal the sophistic nature of this argument. For nothing is said about the main point. Every political superstructure is determined in the last resort by the production relations of the given society,⁴ and this conditions the radical, social opposition of any form of bourgeois political and ideological superstructure, on the one hand, and the corresponding social institutions under socialism, on the other. This is also revealed in a concrete social analysis of the above-mentioned "six features".

¹ *Our Friends Speak. Greetings to the 24th CPSU Congress*, Moscow, p. 345.

² *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, p. 99.

³ C. J. Friedrich and Z. K. Brzezinski, *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1965, p. 21.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 81.

What is the concrete class content, for example, of ideologies? In this particular case we see, on the one hand, the irrational ideology of the most reactionary and openly terrorist groups of state-monopoly capitalism—the ideology of chauvinism, racism, militarism and anti-communism—and on the other hand, the ideology of the working class and the whole of progressive mankind, the scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism, the ideology of proletarian internationalism, peace and friendship among peoples, the revolutionary ideology of social and national liberation, the building of socialism and communism. The remaining features are equally sophistic, since they ignore the concrete social content of the phenomena under examination.

By total distortion of both the present and the past of political power in the socialist countries, the bourgeois ideologists have recently been devoting special attention to the prospects for its “evolution”. Thus, for example, the well-known anti-communist “expert”, Robert Conquest, wrote in 1968: “...a communist regime may indeed evolve into a ‘bourgeois-democratic’ position as Imre Nagy did in 1956, and the Czechs seem to be doing now.”¹ “Ideological change will help to bring on political change,”² writes Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the Institute of Communist Affairs of Columbia University, about the processes taking place in the East European countries.

The events of 1956 in Hungary and 1968 in Czechoslovakia, on which R. Conquest and his like placed their hopes really did have features in common. Janos Kadar spoke of this in no uncertain terms at a press conference in Prague in December 1969,³ noting that these events had confirmed the Leninist thesis that the bourgeoisie deprived of power does not accept defeat. The position was aggravated by the fact that the ideological chaos produced by the revisionists corrupted people’s consciousness and gave the class enemy good opportunities for exploiting the disorientated and misled young people for their own ends and mobilising them for the struggle against the socialist republic. The social meaning of these phenomena is obvious and the latter, naturally,

¹ *Foreign Affairs*, No. 4, 1968, p. 735.

² *Ibid.*, No. 2, 1968, p. 268.

³ See *Pravda*, December 20, 1969.

had nothing whatsoever in common with "democratisation" of the political system.

How is the concept of the "democratisation" of socialist countries dealt with by bourgeois ideologists? J. La Palombara, Professor of Political Science at Yale University, writes, for example, that in his opinion the East European states are "capable of changing ... opposition itself has a way of re-emerging ... and it is this fact that forces us to consider quite seriously whether some form of pluralism is not only the desirable arrangement politically but also the most efficacious from the standpoint of orderly and salutary economic change".¹

The theoreticians of "evolutionism" interpret progress in the socialist countries (as Zbigniew Brzezinski and William Griffith explained in *Foreign Affairs*) as a process of the gradual evolution of the socialist states from the "Soviet type" to the Western form of "social democracy"². The criterion for this "progress" depicted as a process of "democratisation" is the abolition of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the socialist countries and the transition to the so-called free play of political forces, i.e., to the struggle of political parties for power.

This standpoint proceeds from the characteristic way in which bourgeois specialists frame the question about the principles of democracy. This question was examined, for example, at a symposium in West Berlin attended by 200 Western ideologists. The discussions were published in the book *La démocratie à l'épreuve du XXe siècle*. The well-known sociologist Raymond Aron, who presided at the symposium, stressed, for example, as an essential basis for democracy "...the free competition of parties and people at elections for the exercise of power".³ The "confrontation of ideas" and "competition between parties" is considered a fundamental condition for the functioning of democratic institutions.

It is this "model" of Western democracy that the bourgeois ideologists advertise as the ideal for "democratisation" of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Imposing this "model" on the processes of social develop-

¹ *Political Parties and Political Development*. Ed. by Joseph La Palombara and Myron Weiner, New Jersey, 1966, p. 41.

² *Foreign Affairs*, No. 4, 1966, p. 663.

³ *La démocratie à l'épreuve du XXe siècle*, Paris, 1960, p. 16.

ment in the socialist countries, certain anti-communist ideologists also discuss the emergence of symptoms of "pluralism" in the latter. "Over the past few decades, new social groups (scientists, technical and managerial personnel) have emerged, with a stake in the system and a desire for personal and material security," writes Professor of Political Science A. Rubinstein. "Some social scientists," he continues, "hold that the embourgeoisement of communist systems will in the foreseeable future, result in the diminution of Communist party hegemony, that economic development will give rise to influential interest groups outside the Communist party, and that industrialisation, urbanisation and affluence will mellow totalitarianism, erode communist rule, and a meaningful democratisation of communist systems, thereby making them more akin to the western democracies."¹

It is obvious that "concern" about the "democratisation" of socialism boils down in practice to hopes for undermining socialism from within. As Leonid Brezhnev so rightly noted at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, bourgeois ideologists are not concerned with socialism, but "would like to return us to bourgeois orders and, therefore, attempt to impose their bourgeois democracy, democracy for the exploiters, alien to the interests of the people"².

It is with these aims in mind that the reactionary theoreticians distort the nature of the political system in the socialist countries and work out all manner of recipes for changing it. In this connection bourgeois ideologists are having increasingly less recourse to slandering the "totalitarian" system and are advancing more refined theories.

A new concept has even appeared among bourgeois ideologists which they regard as suitable for defining the socialist system, the concept of the "administered society".³

The falsifying nature of this version can be seen, firstly, in the attempts to depict the Party leadership of social development as the rule of a "powerful élite" imposed on society, i.e., in the distortion of the basic feature of this leadership, namely, the unbreakable, indissoluble organic

¹ Alvin Z. Rubinstein, *Communist Political Systems*, New Jersey, 1966, pp. 375-376.

² *24th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 99.

³ Alvin Z. Rubinstein, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

link of the Party and its leadership with the broad masses of working people, with all classes and social groups in socialist society. Secondly, in the attempts to distinguish between the Party leadership of social life and Marxism or, to be more precise, the Marxist thesis of the withering away of the state. At the basis of this falsification lies ignorance of the prolonged, dialectical nature of the process of withering away of the state (only through maximal development of democracy and given the right concrete historical conditions). And, thirdly, in the attempts to distinguish between Party leadership, the "state bureaucracy" and the various "interest groups"—the technicians and experts ... the producers, the artists and writers, professors and critics or journalists who, it is claimed, have a potential "for independent influence in the society" in a "pluralistic political framework"¹. Here again the ideological and political unity of all social and professional groups in socialist society is ignored. Fourthly, the author of this version assumes that "within the administered society" there would take place "a very slow erosion of the Bolshevik heritage".²

The ill-foundedness of this assumption proceeds from ignoring the scientific nature of Party leadership, from wrongly divorcing scientific ideology from the scientific management of society.

In 1969, in the anti-communist periodical *Problems of Communism* attempts were made to link the question of a new "political model" for the socialist countries with the economic reform. The political consequences of the economic reform were depicted as an inevitable weakening of the guiding role of the Party and strengthening of the role of the "technocrats". Referring to revisionist speeches the gist of which was that the "Communist Party is no longer capable of leading a modern industrial society", the magazine supported the establishment in the socialist countries of multi-party systems "for accommodating the conflicting interest groups". These interest groups, according to the writer of an article, are embodied in the trade unions, the "technocrats" and the various opposition groups within the Party itself.³

¹ Alvin Z. Rubinstein, op. cit., p. 382.

² Ibid., p. 386.

³ "Political Patterns and Economic Reforms", *Problems of Communism*, 1969, March-April, pp. 11-23.

As we have seen from the above exposition of the arguments of bourgeois ideologists, they all advance the following propositions:

1. The Western model of "pluralist democracy" which presupposes the existence of a political opposition and the struggle for power must be regarded as the criterion of democratism.

2. The development of socialist society gives rise to the emergence of social groups with conflicting interests, which is bound to lead to a weakening of the leading role of the Communist Party and a gradual transition of the political superstructure in the socialist countries to "political pluralism". This process is regarded by bourgeois theoreticians as a process of the "democratisation" of the socialist countries.

Let us examine these propositions more closely.

Firstly, there are no grounds whatsoever for regarding the theory of "pluralist democracy" in the form in which it is preached and practised in the countries of the capitalist West, as a model of democratism.

This theory is essentially an apologetic attempt to conceal the true class nature of political power in capitalist countries, to depict capitalist society as the sum total of social strata linked by type of occupation, profession and convictions. The theoreticians of "pluralistic democracy" argue that "social prosperity" is attained as a result of the collision and reconciliation of the interests of these various groups.

In fact, political power in bourgeois states belongs to monopoly capital, and the state which protects this power is supported by bourgeois, reformist (which also exercise bourgeois influence) and other organisations. The main organisations which have a say in the exercise of political power in the capitalist countries are the powerful capitalist unions (associations of industrialists, such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce in the United States of America; the Confederation of British Industry and the National Union of Manufacturers in Britain; the Union of German Employers in West Germany, and so on); the political parties, which reflect the group interests of various factions of the ruling class; the reformist parties and trade unions which, to the extent in which they follow the line of the bourgeoisified Right-wing reactionary leaders

and theoreticians, are "part of the social machine of the bourgeois state";¹ the church and religious organisations which spread views advantageous to the ruling class.

The existence and activities of many parties fighting for power in the capitalist countries do not alter the class nature of the bourgeois state. This system ensures only the possibility of competition between inter-class groups of the bourgeoisie, which in the final analysis reflects the competition inherent in the capitalist mode of production.

As for the real opposition parties and organisations (Communist and Workers' parties, Left trade-union associations and other organisations and unions which do not form part of the bourgeois dictatorship), they are subjected to victimisation, repression and terror, the powerful means of propaganda wielded by the bourgeoisie are used to pour the most sophisticated slander upon them; their aims, theoretical principles, and methods are distorted. In a word, all possible measures are taken to compromise them in the eyes of the broad mass of the population.

In spite of much loud talk about freedom and democracy, the states of the capitalist West make the most blatant use of force against Communist parties, participants in the peace movement, progressively inclined people, and "coloured" citizens, for example, the Negroes in the USA.

It is to these truly progressive social forces that the future belongs, however, for they represent the basic interests of the working people who comprise the overwhelming majority of the gainfully employed population in the developed capitalist countries (from 72 to 93 per cent).²

The whole course of social development shows that imperialism has come into collision with the vital interests of manual and mental workers, that imperialism alone is guilty of war crimes and the arms race, that imperialism alone is guilty of the fact that the mass of the population in the

¹ The American trade unions, for example, are defined by the sociologists Melvin J. Vincent and Jackson Mayer as institutions which "oppose communism and fascism and support democratic government and gradual change" (*New Foundation for Industrial Sociology*, Princeton, Toronto, London, New York, 1959, p. 279).

² See V. S. Semyonov, *Capitalism and Classes*, Moscow, 1969, p. 185 (in Russian).

Asian, African and Latin American countries is forced to live in poverty. The growth of the working-class and democratic movements against the reactionary domestic and foreign policies of the imperialist states is most convincing testimony to the fact that it is not democratism but the attack on democracy, the rejection of democracy that is becoming increasingly characteristic of the Western capitalist countries. The turn from democracy to reaction is a general law of imperialism. This law manifests itself differently in different countries. In some cases there is open recourse to fascist methods of government and blatant repression of the vestiges of democracy, in others, the traditional institutions of bourgeois democracy, maintained by imperialism, adjust themselves to the demands of reaction, legal opportunities are created for the activity of neo-fascist and racist organisations, international agreements are ignored, and the use by the working people of parliamentary institutions, democratic rights and freedoms is restricted even further.

Attacks on the democratic rights of the working people in the capitalist countries are frequently accompanied by a strengthening of executive power, the armed forces and the police, nullification of the role of parliament and identification of democracy with the state mechanism of capitalist rule. The combination of dictatorial methods of government with the fiction of parliament void of democratic content and reduced to pure formality, is a manifestation of fascisation in new forms.

If one examines the problem of democratism from a scientific standpoint, this framing of the question demands first and foremost that one proceeds from scientific methodological principles, namely, it is essential to take into account: the relation between the concept of democracy and the social system, the concrete social content of a given political organisation of society (the representatives of which classes are exercising political power, in the interests of which social classes is the domestic and foreign policy of a given state being pursued); and the relation between the concept of democracy and the politico-juridical aspect of the rights and freedoms of the citizen.

At the basis of democracy, as of the political superstructure as a whole, lie property relations. Lenin put the question thus: "democracy based on private property, or on a strug-

gle for the abolition of private property?"¹ Transferring the means of production to public ownership ensures economic democracy — a relationship based on equal rights of the working people to the wealth of society. This creates real conditions for "every representative of the masses, every citizen ... to participate in the discussion of state laws, in the choice of his representatives and in the implementation of state laws."²

In his report to the 24th Congress of the CPSU, the General Secretary of the Party Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev, said: "Soviet people have their own democracy, a socialist democracy, with their own principles and traditions for developing it. There is no freedom in general, just as there is no democracy in general. These are class concepts. That is how Lenin put the question, and that is how our Party puts it today. We see the meaning and content of socialist democracy in the increasingly broader participation of the masses in the administration of state and social affairs. In our country the entire political system of society and the steadily growing initiative of the people serve the building of communism. This sort of democracy is vital to us and it is an indispensable condition for the development and consolidation of socialist social relations.

"The Party's constant concern is that our socialist democracy should steadily develop and that every person should feel he is a citizen in the full sense of the word, a citizen interested in the cause of the entire people and bearing his share of responsibility. The Party will go on consistently implementing this very line."³

Soviet socialist democracy is the democracy of the working class, the working peasantry and the people's intelligentsia.

The social structure of Soviet society is reflected in its representative organs.

The decisions and resolutions passed at sessions of the Soviets are fully discussed in advance. Thus, for example, the new law—the Fundamentals of Legislation of the USSR

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 117.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 27, p. 212.

³ *24th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 99.

and the Union Republics on Health Protection—passed by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR at its meeting on December 19, 1969, was discussed beforehand in the central, republican and local press and by groups of working people. More than 3,000 proposals were addressed to the Supreme Soviet alone.

A broad democratic procedure is also applied in the drafting and passing resolutions by mass organisations. Thus, for example, the draft of the new Collective-Farm Rules was widely discussed in the collective farms, at various conferences and assemblies of collective farmers, in the press and in various research establishments. Many millions of people took part in this nation-wide debate.

The democratism of the socialist state also manifests itself in the fact that the proportion of functions connected with state coercion is steadily decreasing in the state organs, and the role of voluntary social activity of people who are drawn in social self-administration through their participation in local and central bodies, in various social organisations, increases.

The true path to the right conditions for the withering away of the state lies in the broadest possible development of socialist democracy. Lenin said: "The more complete the democracy, the nearer the moment when it becomes unnecessary."¹ However, the withering away of the state is a long and gradual process which takes place on the basis of the development of communism. This process depends on both internal and external conditions. The way to achieve the withering away of the state is to gradually bring increasingly large numbers of the working people into the management of the country, to educate people in a spirit of communism and raise the level of consciousness and activity of all the members of socialist society.

The Soviet legislative system is democratic because it asserts the freedom of the individual in the broadest sense of the word. What we have in mind here is the positive assertion of various categories of rights and freedoms, namely:

— guaranteed socio-economic rights: the right to work, the right to leisure, to material provision in old age,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 474.

sickness, and disablement, the right to education and the right to personal ownership;

— guaranteed political rights: the equality of all citizens irrespective of sex, nationality or race, freedom of speech, the press, assembly, meetings, demonstrations, and association in mass organisations, electoral rights;

— guaranteed personal freedoms of citizens (in the narrow, state-juridical sense of the word): immunity of person, inviolability of residence, secrecy of correspondence, freedom of conscience, the right of the accused to defence, etc.

Criminal and civil law and administrative and disciplinary action are applied only in cases where the individual acts in an arbitrary way against the interests of society.

Naturally, Soviet democracy is constantly developing and improving.

The role of the Soviets is growing steadily. In recent years measures have been taken in the Soviet Union to extend the rights of district, town, village and township Soviets, to increase their responsibility for implementing economic and cultural tasks. Over two million deputies participate in the work of the Soviets and 25 million people give voluntary assistance to the Soviets in their activities.

Soviet socialist democracy embraces all aspects of the life of society, including the economic aspect. Of great importance for its consolidation is the economic reform, which is stimulating initiative and a sense of responsibility in workers' collectives and all the workers tackling problems of the national economy. An important place in the development of socialist democracy is occupied by the work of mass organisations of the working people, above all the trade unions and the Komsomol, which carry out important functions in the management of society.

The consolidation and flowering of socialist democracy opens up possibilities for each Soviet person to demonstrate his highest civic qualities to the full.

The socio-economic system of socialism ensures the gradual destruction of classes and the establishment of social equality.

All social classes and groups have undergone substantial changes under socialism, and their further development is marked by the strengthening of their socio-political and ideological unity and their steady progress along the path

to full social homogeneity. Whereas in the past historical development in antagonistic formations led logically to increasing class differentiation, the establishment of socialism leads to a gradual overcoming of this differentiation.

In the transition period from capitalism to socialism, when a fierce struggle takes place between capitalism, vanquished but not yet totally destroyed, and the steadily maturing forces of socialism, a social base still exists for the struggle against socialism. It is this that the imperialist reaction, its agents, and people which have come under the influence of anti-communist propaganda, try to exploit.

Under developed socialism, class antagonisms have already been removed, but class distinctions remain, although they gradually obliterate. There are no social groups, the interests of which would conflict with one another. All social groups and strata are characterised by the organic coincidence of their basic interests. This explains why the predictions of anti-communist ideologists that the peoples of the socialist countries will return to the "pluralist model" of democracy, in which the "struggle for power" is supposed to take place, are nothing but a reactionary utopia.

It is not surprising that the main target of bourgeois ideologists is the Communist parties. As the party of the working class and the vanguard of the whole people, the Communist Party possesses a scientific theory of social development, organises and educates the masses, serves as an example of communist attitude to work, leads the struggle against vestiges of the past, moulds the communist world outlook of the working people, helps backward elements to overcome vacillation and prejudice, and deals with the issues of the day in a creative way.

Constantly governed by Marxist-Leninist theory, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union creatively examines the new phenomena of social life, its main tendencies, and ensures the efficient functioning of all government and non-government organisations and their smooth coordination. The guiding role of the Party is constantly growing with the ever broadening scope of the creative activity of the Soviet people and serves as a reliable guarantee of the future successes of communist construction, including the perfection of socialist democracy.

Bourgeois social thought does not, of course, confine itself to predicting the future of the socialist system. Anti-communist theoreticians attempt to develop an alternative to the communist future of mankind. This is also the occupation of so-called futurology. The futurological institutes are very motley in both composition and functions. The people in charge of them vary in their academic and political standing and are frequently most reactionary. One finds eminent atomic physicists, biologists, architects, medical experts, etc., working in these organisations.

Naturally, the very fact that many leading scientists from various branches of natural science and technology, are brought into the study of futurological problems means that the resultant concrete scientific and technological predictions contain a great deal that is worthy of attention. However, it must be noted that these predictions also reveal profound contradictions, firstly, between the splendid possibilities offered by scientific and technological development, on the one hand, and the social consequences of this development, on the other, and, secondly, between the bold, imaginative flights of scientific thought by the representatives of the natural sciences and the extremely narrow horizons for social development, which is seen by the futurologists at best as the perfection of capitalism.

Scientific and technological advance creates immense possibilities for improving the standard of living, but the practical application of these achievements is limited by the private property system and results in increased exploitation of the working people. This contradiction is reflected in futurological studies. For example, the futurologists argue that the development of radio electronics, cybernetics, computer technology, automation, etc., will make a lot of people "redundant". And that this will mean an increase in crime and drug-taking. Population growth in the countries that are liberating themselves from colonial rule is usually associated with an increase in the number of starving and with the spread of "revolts" and "violence".

Bourgeois futurology not only does not conclude the need for a radical solution to the problems engendered by the modern scientific and technological revolution, the need

for a radical revolutionary change of the socio-economic system in countries where capitalist relations predominate, but its theoretical principles also reflect fully the class interests of the imperialists, which are irreconcilably hostile to social progress and, consequently, to the communist transformation of the world.

Professor O. Flechtheim of West Berlin is regarded as one of the main theoreticians of modern bourgeois futurology. Already in the foreword of his *History and Futurology* he attacks "the outdated conception of progress" and announces that futurology has put an end to "traditional linear theories of history", and that from now on the symbol of the age will be "the net, not the arrow".¹ In what nets does Professor Flechtheim hope to catch his readers?

Explaining the meaning of this symbol in his book, he stresses that "instead of a ruthless linear movement forward" futurology will study "horizontal phenomena" in society, similar to the phenomena studied in the physical field theory or *Gestalt* psychology.

Flechtheim tells us that his ideological predecessor was Spengler. What is meant here is not so much Spengler's well-known social pessimism as his methodological principles.

The initial premises of futurology are full of apologetic striving to prove that the capitalist system is healthy and viable. However, anxiety for the future also makes itself felt in Flechtheim's conception, in spite of his official optimism. For example, he admits the possibility of the decline of Western civilisation "as a result of further wars and revolutions... leading up to a complete breakdown of modern society and a regression in all fields of human achievement...."² In this connection, Flechtheim strongly recommends a different perspective which, in his opinion, is more likely, namely, "the slow and painful emergence of a world equilibrium".³ Firmly criticising any prediction which admits the emergence of anything radically new, he suggests a democratic "*reconstruction of our civilisation ... without recourse to war,*

¹ Ossip K. Flechtheim, *History and Futurology*, Foreword, Meisenheim-am-Glan, 1966.

² O. K. Flechtheim, op. cit., p. 65.

³ Ibid.

dictatorship and revolution" by means of "rational accommodation and compromise".¹

While defending the existing capitalist system, Flechtheim insists nevertheless that he is against the status quo. He writes: "Today we are living in an unbelievably revolutionary age. Whatever may be in store for us, the status quo will not endure."²

Thus we see that the much vaunted latest futurology fits in entirely with the well-known reformist claim to transform capitalism, to refurbish and improve it by means of a "peaceful transformation", but on no account by revolution, on no account by creating a new socio-economic and political order.

The tendency to defend capitalism by appealing to the reformation of capitalism was noted by Lenin even before the October Revolution. "Instead of waging an open, principled and direct struggle against all the fundamental tenets of socialism in defence of the absolute inviolability of private property and freedom of competition," he wrote, "the bourgeoisie of Europe and America, as represented by their ideologists and political leaders, are coming out increasingly in defence of so-called social reforms as opposed to the idea of social revolution. Not liberalism versus socialism, but reformism versus socialist revolution — is the formula of the modern, 'advanced', educated bourgeoisie."³ This formula is repeated by Flechtheim.

The futurological conception is directed firmly against revolutionary changes, against any form of qualitative change. Here Flechtheim again pays tribute to Spengler. The latter, as is well known, was the founder of historical prediction based on the mechanistic transfer to the future of phenomena which have taken place in the past. Hence his predilection for superficial analogies which scorn the content of qualitatively different historical processes, hence his treatment of historical knowledge as something primarily intuitive. Flechtheim, in his turn, stresses that "futuresology could take its place with other branches of knowledge which

¹ O. K. Flechtheim, op. cit. p. 94.

² Ibid., p. 81.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 229.

like philosophy or sociology have to rely considerably on speculation and intuition".¹

Using this type of method, Flechtheim reaches a general conclusion which provides convincing evidence of the fact that futurology serves its own master. "In contrast to an ideological fixation of the past and to an utopian glorification of the future, a futurological approach would include the future as a specific dimension of the present."²

This admission helps us to understand the essence of futurology as a new device for defending the capitalist system, as a new ideological weapon in the struggle against the revolutionary transformation of the world, but we are justified in asking: what does all this have to do with the science of the future of mankind? We see that futurology is simply further confirmation of the fact that bourgeois social thought is lacking this science.

But perhaps, although they do not possess the scientific theory enabling them to pinpoint the objective laws and prospects for the future, bourgeois futurologists have nevertheless created an ideal of the future, sketched even in the most general outline a picture of the social structure which, in their opinion, we should expect for our descendants? The activities of the futurological centres make it possible for us to quote certain data in response to this question.

The leading futurologists of the capitalist world depict the next century as the reign of a science-fiction type of scientific and technological progress. There is, of course, nothing surprising about this. The scientific and technological revolution is making such gigantic strides that no one doubts it will continue to do so. According to some futurologists, in the 21st century, too, mankind will be divided into two parts. One-fifth of people will be engaged in creative labour, while four-fifths will earn their living.

The Commission on the Year 2000, set up in the United States in October 1965, together with the Hudson Institute, has produced a work entitled *The Year 2000. A Framework for Speculation on the Next Thirty-Three Years*.

¹ O. K. Flechtheim, op. cit., p. 95.

² Ibid., p. 109.

In this book the American sociologist Daniel Bell announces that all the groups of scientists who helped to compile it took for granted the assumption that "the United States is becoming a post-industrial society"....¹

The book contains a list of the basic indices which are supposed to provide a generalised description of this society, but there is no mention of its social characteristics, no description of its basis, and not a word about who will own the means of production or who will hold political power. The features of the "post-industrial" society are given mainly as quantitative characteristics proceeding from technological development or as hypothetical tendencies in the spiritual life of society which are fully in accordance with the interests of the ruling classes in the capitalist world.

The futurologists completely ignore conflicting class interests and pay no attention to the class struggle and its results. In general outline the future social system retains the social inequality and unemployment inherent in capitalist society. Thus, according to the distribution of labour cited in the book, only half the population will work the whole year round, the other half being wholly or partly unemployed.² Two-thirds of all the families will have an income below the national average. The sharp contrasts in income level will also be maintained throughout the world; what is more, the per capita product in countries with a highly developed industry will exceed that of the less industrially developed countries by a factor not of 12 times but 18 times.³

If one adds to all this the prediction made by one of the book's editors, Herman Kahn, that the growth of material affluence will be accompanied by the moral and spiritual degradation of society, it is not difficult to guess that in sketching a picture of the year 2000 the authors have remained on capitalist ground and that the post-industrial society is capitalism projected into the future.⁴

¹ *The Year 2000. A Framework for Speculation on the Next Thirty-Three Years*, Ed. by H. Kahn and A. Wiener, New York-London, 1967. XXVII.

² *Ibid.*, p. 196.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

⁴ This was confirmed by D. Bell's report at the VII International Sociological Congress, held in Varna in September 1970.

The only feature of this society which obviously conflicts with the existing social order in capitalist society is D. Bell's predicted reorganisation of the state mechanism in accordance with a "rational principle", the elevation of the role of universities and scientific research establishments and the role of scientists in the management of society. In fact the situation we find is totally the reverse: a growing divergence between both the domestic and foreign policies of imperialism and rational social requirements. This objective tendency towards the strengthening of reactionary policy of imperialism is having a serious effect on the mood of bourgeois intellectuals, including scientists. As the intelligentsia increases in numbers in capitalist society, so differentiation within its ranks also increases. This fully confirms the following prediction made by Lenin as early as the end of the last century. "In all spheres of people's labour, capitalism increases the number of *office and professional workers* with particular rapidity and makes a growing demand for intellectuals. The latter occupy a special position among the other classes, attaching themselves partly to the bourgeoisie by their connections, their outlooks, etc., and partly to the wage-workers as capitalism increasingly deprives the intellectual of his independent position, converts him into a hired worker and threatens to lower his living standard."¹ It is these processes which are now taking place on a large scale in the capitalist world. There are no grounds whatsoever for assuming that scientific personnel in the Western capitalist countries will devote themselves exclusively to the "perfecting" of the capitalist system. The intelligentsia in the capitalist world is faced with the following choice: either of serving capitalism obediently and fulfilling the role of its ideological defenders, the henchmen and heralds of imperialism, or of joining with the working class and all working people in the struggle against imperialism and the capitalist monopolies and in support of the revolutionary transformation of the world. There is no doubt that the finest sections of the intelligentsia will choose the progressive alternative. Already many students, intellectuals and scientists in Europe and America are joining the ranks of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 202.

fighters against the imperialist policy of exploitation, plunder, racism and neo-fascism.

In examining certain characteristic features of modern bourgeois futurology, we have dealt only with its social aspects, its general conclusions about the future of mankind, and have not touched upon questions concerning the applied and natural sciences. Although there is undoubtedly a fundamental difference between the socialist and capitalist approach to scientific and technological forecasting resulting from a different methodology and class orientation, some interesting generalisations and factual information on individual aspects of science and technology are nevertheless to be found in works by bourgeois futurologists.

It is for this reason that we have devoted the following section of our collective work to an examination of concrete scientific and technological forecasting.

Part IV

PROBLEMS OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING

Chapter 1

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING IN THE WEST

Today the problems of social progress and the prospects for the development of science and technology are of concern not only to the solitary thinker, as several centuries ago, nor to a comparatively narrow circle of the intelligentsia, as a hundred years or so ago, but to the hundreds of millions of people all over our planet. What is the outlook for the struggle of the world systems of socialism and capitalism, and for the international working-class and national liberation movements? What are the likely socio-economic consequences of the scientific and technological revolution taking place before our very eyes? Will mankind succeed in avoiding a catastrophic third world war and what should be done for this purpose? Such questions are so closely bound up with the personal lives of each and every one of us today, that interest in the future of the Earth and mankind has assumed truly mass proportions, and literature on this subject — both fiction and non-fiction — has become more popular than ever.¹

The works of the various authors, who differ from one another considerably, contain various approaches to the problems of the future, to defining the degree of importance of these problems, and suggesting ways of solving them. They reflect the complex process of the effect on western ideology

¹ See bibliography in the book by I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada *Window Into the Future. Current Problems of Social Forecasting*, Moscow, 1970 (in Russian).

of the advances in the world socio-political arena which have taken place under the influence of the world socialist system, the international working-class and national liberation movements, and also the modern scientific and technological revolution.

The forecasts of eminent Western scientists pose important problems of progress in science and technology and vivid pictures of a possible future for the Earth and mankind. It is typical that, unlike the philosophico-historical conceptions of modern bourgeois thinkers, many of these works are full of sober optimism regarding the creative possibilities of mankind, and its future.

True, not all problems concerning scientific forecasting are illuminated equally in these works. As a rule, the writers devote more attention, for understandable reasons, to those which seem to them the most pressing. In addition, the particular world outlook and specialised knowledge of the writer are also reflected, which almost always gives the exposition of the problem a certain one-sidedness.

Let us deal briefly with a number of important problems of scientific and technological forecasting. These are, in our opinion (in relation to the literature of the Western capitalist countries) the following:

1. Population growth and food resources;
2. Use of mineral and fuel resources in the future;
3. Man and the machine;
4. Town planning, transport and communications;
5. The information "explosion";
6. The exploration of outer space;
7. The influence of science on the spiritual life of mankind in the future.

Population growth and food resources

In 1900, the world population was roughly 1,500 million, in 1950 over 2,500 million, in 1960 about 3,000 million, and today it exceeds 3,500 million. According to UNESCO statistics, given the present rate of increase it will be more than 6,000 million in the year 2000.¹ And according to FAO

¹ Otto Rühle, *Brot für sechs Milliarden. Die Menschheit an der Schwelle des dritten Jahrtausends: Probleme, Prognosen, Perspektiven*, Leipzig, Jena, Berlin, 1963, S. 87.

estimates the production of food will have to be doubled by 1980 and tripled by 2000 to provide a decent level of nutrition for the world's peoples (bearing in mind that at present most of mankind is half-starving).¹

Dennis Gabor notes that the existing forms of "aid" given by the economically developed countries of the capitalist world to the developing Asian, African and Latin American countries merely make the problem more acute, without solving it. The supply of medicaments and disinfecting agents to the developing countries and expansion of the medical service there lead to a sharp decrease in mortality, particularly infant mortality (although the latter is still far higher than in the United States and Western Europe), and to an even sharper increase in the rates of population growth. Meanwhile far less substantial advances are taking place in the economy of these countries and it cannot keep pace with the growth in the number of consumers.²

At the same time scientists note the tremendous possibilities for increasing mankind's food resources.

According to Fritz Baade, it would be quite possible to double or even triple the area of land under cultivation (which today comprises only 10 per cent of land surface in the tropical and temperate zones, including arable land, orchards and plantations). But it would also be possible to increase yields on the existing area by general application of agro-technical advances to such an extent as to satisfy the need for food basically. The transition from the use of draught animals to mechanised cultivation alone would, in his opinion, lead to an increase in yield and saving in fodder which would provide food for another thousand million people at least. It is a fact that at the present time of the 350 million families engaged in agriculture a minimum of 250 million (more than 70 per cent) use either the hoe or the wooden plough as their only agricultural implements.³

George Thomson and many other Western scientists are in full agreement with Baade. Their forecasts on the same

¹ *Scientific American*, September 1963, pp. 73, 80; see also: F. Baade, *Competition by the Year of 2000*, Moscow, 1962, p. 37.

² See Dennis Gabor, *Inventing the Future*, London, 1963, p. 79.

³ F. Baade, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-42.

question are based on real trends in the growth of agricultural production in the economically developed countries. Thus, in the opinion of experts from the US Department of Agriculture, if the present rate of agricultural output is maintained, there will be twice as much food in the economically developed countries by the year 2000 than is required for meeting the needs of the comparatively slowly rising population of these countries.¹

At the same time, according to the President of the World Association for the Struggle Against Hunger, the well-known Brazilian scientist Josué de Castro, two-thirds of the world's population are starving.²

Closely bound up with all this is the problem of rationalising the size of the world population in the future, which occupies an important place in the forecasting of Western scientists. The range of the various conceptions here is extremely broad: from a few hundred million living in a rural idyll to hundreds of thousands of millions living mainly on food products made from chlorella, soya beans and synthetic food.

Many Western scientists, examining the future outlook for the growth of the world population, base their forecasts mainly on extrapolation of existing modern trends, although these trends will obviously undergo substantial changes in the future. On the basis of such extrapolation Fred Hoyle, for example, has reached the extremely pessimistic conclusion that in a thousand years' time the space quota for each person will drop to one square metre, making the problems of living space, transport, holiday resorts, etc., very acute.³ He proceeds from the fact that not only will the present population growth rate remain unchanged, but also the present gap between the highly developed and developing countries.

Other scientists, for example George Thomson, believe that cultural and economic development and increasingly widespread use of contraceptives, as well as a rise in average life expectancy and a corresponding drop in the birth-

¹ *Scientific American*, September 1963, pp. 73, 80.

² See *Quel avenir attend l'homme?*, p. 65.

³ F. Hoyle, *Of Men and Galaxies*, University of Washington Press, 1964, p. 49.

rate may considerably reduce the growth rate of world population¹.

Isaac Asimov maintains that solving the problem of "living space" for rapidly growing mankind can be facilitated by the conquest of other planets in the solar system. He gives an interesting interpretation of the well-known theory of Konstantin Tsiolkovsky about the possibility of colonising the asteroid belt, proposing that the asteroids should first be fragmented in order to increase the area in which they can be settled.²

The American scientist John Fisher thinks it likely that colonisation of planets and asteroids will begin in the first half of the 21st century and that an additional century may lead to the colonisation of perhaps a thousand asteroids, and a few more centuries to the time when these city-states will each have a population comparable to one of today's nations.³

One of the most impressive projects of this kind is that published in 1960 by the eminent American theoretical physicist Freeman John Dyson, which assumes (in what is basically a development of Tsiolkovsky's idea) that in about 2,500-3,000 years' time it will be possible to construct a dense sphere with a radius of about one astronomic unit (150 million kilometres) around the sun out of the mass of a planet (Jupiter, for example). Dyson believes it would be possible to create on the inside of this huge meta-planet an artificial biosphere with an area about a thousand million times larger than that of the earth. Reconstructed in this way the solar system would be capable of providing heat and light for 3×10^{23} people, i.e., a hundred thousand times more than the world population in 1965.⁴

Examining the prospects for the more immediate future, Arthur Clarke takes the view, not without justification, that in dealing with problems of over-population one must not rely exclusively on the colonisation of planets, since already

¹ George Thomson, *The Foreseeable Future*, pp. 125-27.

² Isaac Asimov, *A View from a Height*, London, 1963, pp. 246, 248.

³ John C. Fisher, "Man's Future in Space", *Proceedings of the IRE*, May 1962, Vol. 50, No. 5, p. 619.

⁴ See I. S. Shklovsky, *The Universe. Life. Reason*, Moscow, 1965, p. 260 (in Russian). Dyson's idea was strongly criticised in Soviet scientific literature (see, for example, *Priroda* (Nature), 1964, No. 11).

in our day the world population is increasing by about 100,000 a day. He concludes that "the population battle must be fought and won here on Earth".¹

But how? A substantial number of scientists in Western Europe and the United States still regard the forcible restriction of the birth-rate in the developing countries as the only answer to this question, thereby ignoring the main problems—the abolition in these countries of the socio-economic consequences of the colonial policy of the imperialist powers, opposition to the rapacious tendencies of neo-colonialism, and social transformation in directing the developing countries along a non-capitalist path.

As John Bernal stated at a conference held in Royaumont that already today it is possible to supply with food the world population which would live on Earth some centuries later and which will be incomparably more numerous, if a modern or even higher rate of demographic growth is accepted. The world is able to put an end to poverty, but we shall continue to be poor, he added, unless the world is organised the old way.²

By 2000, Professor M. von Ardenne (GDR) agrees with John Bernal, irrigation of vast arid expanses will be possible, as well as the comprehensive mechanisation of agriculture and the synthetic production of food. All this, in his opinion, "will produce such a sharp increase in the production of food that even with a substantial rise in the world population no one will starve. And if human reason and noble humanity can win through in world politics, and if the Soviet Union's disarmament proposals are put into practice, which are aimed at excluding war as a means of solving international disputes, this most noble task of mankind will be solved".³

Use of Mineral and Fuel Resources in the Future

A considerable amount of attention is paid to this problem in Western literature on scientific forecasting. Here one

¹ Arthur C. Clarke, *Profiles of the Future. An Inquiry into the Limits of the Possible*, New York and Evanston, 1962, p. 84.

² *Quel avenir attend l'homme?*, p. 276.

³ M. von Ardenne. "Tekhnika v 2000 godu" in *Nauka i zhizn*, 1962, No. 10, p. 69.

finds a collision between two contradictory conceptions, which take different views of the state of mineral resources and the corresponding outlook for the development of the fuel and raw material base of the world economy.

In this respect George Thomson may be classed among the pessimists. He believes that basic fuel resources (with the exception of coal) will be used up by 1980.¹ Less pessimistic are the estimates of the First International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva in 1955, that the remaining reserves will last for not less than 100-150 years.² With regard to coal reserves, even Thomson agrees that they should last for at least another 4,000 years (given the 1955 scale of extraction).³ Since then substantial new deposits of these useful ores have been discovered and, although the rate of extracting coal, and especially oil, is growing from year to year, new deposits are being found almost annually.

According to P. Putnam and the US Atomic Energy Commission, by the year 2000 a world population twice that of 1960 will be consuming about five times more energy and by 2050 consumption will be approximately thirty times the 1950 level.⁴ Will there be enough fuel resources to keep up these rates?

Fritz Baade gives an optimistic forecast. According to his calculations, even if atomic energy does not reach any considerable proportions by 2000, the traditional sources of energy will ensure the growth of its consumption by four or five times.⁵ Arthur Clarke believes that it will prove technically possible in the near future to work deep-lying coal, oil and ore deposits. "When we consider," he writes, "that our deepest mines (now passing the 7,000 foot level) are mere pinpricks on the surface of our 8,000-mile diameter planet, it is obviously absurd to talk about fundamental

¹ George Thomson, *The Foreseeable Future*, p. 23.

² *Proceedings of the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy*, Vol. I, *The World's Requirements for Energy: The Role of Nuclear Energy*, New York, 1956, p. 46.

³ George Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁴ *Scientific American*, September 1963, p. 112; P. Putnam, *The Energy in the Future*, New York, 1952, p. 113.

⁵ Fritz Baade, *Weltenergiewirtschaft. Atomenergie—Sofortprogramm oder Zukunftsplanung?* Hamburg, 1958, S. 109.

shortages of *any* element or mineral." True, a few pages later he makes the reservation: "*Whatever* new reserves may be discovered, fossil fuels such as coal and oil can last for only a few more centuries; then they will be gone forever".¹ Like many other scientists, Clarke places great hopes on the tremendous possibilities for extracting fossil ores from the ocean bed, and also on using mineral resources from other planets and asteroids as soon as the 21st century.²

But in relation to the 21st century pessimistic forecasts predominate. The US governmental expert Paul Averit maintains that world coal reserves (to say nothing of oil) will be totally exhausted by 2100.³ The Indian physicist J. J. Bhabha announced at the 1964 Geneva Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy that given an annual increase of only 5 per cent in consumption of electric energy world coal reserves will be exhausted in about 75 years, that is, by 2040.

The same applies more or less to forecasts about the use of other minerals. In this respect the estimates by W. S. Woytinsky and E. S. Woytinsky (USA), for the most part unjustified,⁴ are of interest in illustrating the "pessimistic" conceptions (see Table 1).

On the other hand, Dennis Gabor states, not without good reason, that by 1985-1990 mankind will probably embark on a new, higher stage of scientific and technological development, making it necessary to radically reassess our present estimates of minerals. It is likely, he continues, that in the next fifty years it will be difficult to expect any large-scale use of the energy of the sun, wind, tides, earth's inner heat, geothermal waters, etc. But the potential possibilities of these sources of energy are colossal.

Important amendments to forecasts on the outlook for world energy development have been made by the fact that in 1967 there were already 67 atomic electric stations with a total capacity of 12,226 megawatts operating in the world. In 1971, another 42 atomic electric stations with a capacity of 20,047 megawatts were in operation. The

¹ A. C. Clarke, *Profiles of the Future*, pp. 142, 149.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 147, 150.

³ *Scientific American*, September 1963, p. 116.

⁴ W. S. Woytinsky and E. S. Woytinsky, *World Population and Production. Trends and Outlook*, New York, 1953, p. 329.

growth rates of these stations are so high that they compel one to think of nuclear fuel reserves.¹

At present nuclear reactors are burning only uranium 235. According to the latest estimates, all the prospected uranium reserves would hardly be sufficient to supply the world with electric power at the present rate for two hundred years.²

Table 1

**Minerals: Probable Length of Life of Known Reserves,
Under Specified Rates of Consumption**

Minerals	Assumed Per Capita Consumption	
	In All Countries as in 1947-1948	In the United States as in 1948; in Other Countries as in Europe (excluding the USSR in 1948)
Oil (proved and indicated reserves)	22	20
Oil (ultimate reserves)	160	150
Coal (all types)	2200	985
Iron ore (proved and indicated reserves)	200	66
Iron ore (potential reserves)	625	200
Copper	45	20
Lead	33	11
Zinc	39	18
Tin	38	17
Bauxite	200	165

Scientists are placing great hopes on reactors using fast neutrons which are capable of using uranium 238 and thorium 232, turning them into plutonium and uranium 233.³ With widespread use of nuclear power stations of this type the uranium and thorium reserves would last for several thousand years.

¹ "Die Kernkraftwerke der Welt", *Schweizerischen Mechanik—Zeitschrift*, 1968, No. 12.

² Dennis Gabor, *Inventing the Future*, p. 91.

³ Ibid.

According to the forecasts of the US Atomic Energy Commission, 25 per cent of electric energy in the United States will be produced in nuclear power stations by 1980 and 50 per cent by 2000.¹

Scientists regard the possibility of improving modern cycles of energy transformation as an important energy reserve. In particular, they are devoting considerable attention to the problem of direct transformation of heat energy into electric energy by magneto-hydrodynamic means.

Powerful electric power stations with MHD generators are capable of raising the efficiency coefficient to 50-55 per cent, and with further improvement to 60 per cent. At the present time an experimental industrial plant with an MHD generator with a capacity of several dozen megawatts has been set up in the USSR. Preliminary calculations have been made for a powerful (2,400,000 kw) electric power station with MHD generators.

The role of atomic power stations is growing very quickly. In the opinion of Soviet scientists, atomic energy by 1980 will become "a most important factor of further large structural advances in the world fuel balance. One may assume that by 2000 atomic energy will account for 25-30 per cent of all energy produced, which will be equivalent to approximately 20,000 million tons of fuel".² But the possibility of a practical solution of the problem of controlled thermonuclear reaction for the requirements of world energy is still a remote one. "The size of a nuclear reactor using a mixture of deuterium and tritium and the requirements made of its elements are such that they go beyond the framework of the present level of technology. This will be the level of the next 10 to 20 years.... With regard to reaction using pure deuterium, this requires such large magnetic fields and in such a vast volume, that it is difficult to envisage the creation of such a reactor within the next twenty years."³

Research is also being carried on in the Soviet Union on

¹ *Nuclear Energy*, December 1966, p. 251.

² A. A. Beschinsky, D. B. Volfberg, "World Power Resources and Their Use for the Benefit of Mankind", *Izvestia AN SSSR, Energetika i transport*, No. 6, 1968, p. 18 (in Russian).

³ L. A. Artsimovich, "Ohmic Heating of Plasma in Thoridal Systems", *Vestnik AN SSSR*, No. 6, 1969, p. 26 (in Russian).

the use of solar energy for economic purposes. As a result helio plants have been installed, the use of which is producing a considerable saving of fuel in the southern regions of the USSR. A project was recently drawn up for a helio power station with a capacity of 10,000 kw for Central Asia, in which the boiler is replaced by a thermo-electric generator using semi-conductors. The solar energy at such a station is transformed directly into electric energy. The use of these plants will make it possible to find the best technical methods for developing helio power in the future.

Underground thermal waters contain a great deal of heat energy which could be used for water supply, heating or transformation into electrical energy in a normal steam turbine cycle. A geo-thermal power station with a capacity of 5,000 kw in Kamchatka has already begun operation.

It is planned to build powerful tidal power stations which are particularly effective in conjunction with river hydro-electric stations. The potential reserve of tidal energy is about 200,000 million kw.

Many wind turbines are already in operation in the USSR, providing electricity for inhabitants of the tundra, farm workers in the virgin lands and shepherds in Kirghizia. The scale of wind power is increasing annually. The construction of wind power stations is particularly effective in the polar regions and many parts of Central Asia and Siberia, where the average annual wind speed varies from 4 to 9 metres per second.

A great deal of importance is attached to producing electricity with the help of fuel elements which make it possible to transform fuel energy directly into electric energy. The ideal efficiency coefficient in the direct transformation of chemical energy into electrical is close on 100 per cent, but in practice it can reach 80 per cent.

The prospects for the use of "traditional" and new sources of electric energy show that the energy potential in nature is far from being fully exploited. It should be added that existing estimates of the world's energy resources are extremely incomplete due to the fact that this problem has not been fully studied. At present only a small part of the deposits of fossil fuel on dry land has been relatively well investigated. Fuel resources on the sea bed remain practically unstudied. Moreover, with the improvement of methods of surveying

and extraction technology our ideas about the degree to which the earth's depths have been studied are also changing.¹

All this justifies Soviet scientists in making optimistic assessments of the fuel balance of the future.

This gives rise to another problem, namely, how to dispose of radioactive waste from atomic energy. So far this problem (in respect to long-term prospects) has not been satisfactorily solved.

Isaac Asimov suggests that these wastes should be transported in rockets to certain areas in outer space where, in accordance with the law of gravitation, they will remain there, as it were, trapped, for example, at a point a quarter of a million miles from the Moon and a quarter of a million miles from the Earth.²

Nearly all the Western scientists we have mentioned take an extremely optimistic view of the prospects for mastering the secret of controlled thermonuclear reactions. A. C. Clarke is even convinced that energy from the synthesis of hydrogen nuclei will be obtained not later than 1990.³ However, the famous English physicist John Cockroft reminds us that we shall have to increase our knowledge considerably before we can produce an effective nuclear synthesis reactor and, therefore, in his opinion, it is impossible to say whether this will be achieved in the next twenty years. Hoyle even thinks that mankind may be faced with the problem of exhausted energy resources in the next century, if the pace of scientific research is not speeded up considerably. He is highly sceptical about the prospects of using the energy resources of other planets in our galaxy. "We already know what will have to be done about that," he writes. "We must change our energy source to nuclear reactions, uranium and thorium, or perhaps the fusion of deuterium."⁴

The optimism of most Western scientists in forecasting the potentialities of nuclear power can be seen clearly in

¹ A. A. Beschinsky, D. B. Volfberg, "World Power Resources and Their Use for the Benefit of Mankind", *Izvestia AN SSSR*, op. cit., No. 6, 1968 (in Russian).

² Isaac Asimov, *A View from a Height*, London, 1963, pp. 223-24.

³ A. C. Clarke, *Profiles of the Future*, p. 233.

⁴ Fred Hoyle, *Of Men and Galaxies*, p. 63.

their assessment of the outlook for the development of power on a cosmic scale. In this connection one need only recall Dyson's project, which envisages the full use of the energy of solar radiation, references to the possibility of using the masses of large planets in the solar system for nuclear fuel, etc. In general, as A. C. Clarke concludes, not missing the opportunity to have a dig at his society, "we can never run out of energy or matter. But we can all too easily run out of brains".¹

Man and the machine

The problem of the social consequences of cybernetising production has been of interest to society ever since the time of Karel Čapek, the creatures of whose imagination (thinking machines, or robots, as he called them) end up by destroying people. Since then the great advances in automation and electronics have produced a large number of works in the West which paint a tragic picture of the future: either "intelligent automats" decide that the further existence of mankind on earth is superfluous or mankind destroys its cybernetic progeny and degenerates to the level of troglodytes, or it finds itself in the position of the "inferior race" in a machine society.

These ideas have long since ceased to be the property of science-fiction and are now seriously discussed by many Western philosophers, economists and sociologists. "I am troubled by terrible visions," wrote Nikolai Berdyaev as far back as 1933, "the time will come when machines will be so perfect that they will act without any help from man, machines will take over the whole universe ... and the last people, having become useless, unable to breathe and live in this technological environment, will disappear, leaving behind them a new universe created by their reason and their hands."²

Certain Western sociologists supplement this picture with fears of the degradation and destruction of people, whom "thinking machines" doom to all sorts of humiliating work or

¹ A. C. Clarke, op. cit., p. 155.

² Quoted from G. N. Volkov, *The Era of Robots or the Era of Man?* Moscow, 1965, p. 155 (in Russian).

simply kill mercilessly. The American scientist Robert Bowie, for example, sees the chief threat to humanity not in a nuclear war, but in "an interconnected computer system, which will acquire a consciousness of its own existence and a desire for its own enhancement", but "our dependence upon the system will be such that we dare not shut it off".¹

The total inconsistency of such views is convincingly demonstrated by the eminent English physiologist W. Grey Walter. "As a child frightened by a teased puppy will say he met a bear," he writes, "so we tend to project into these docile slaves of the laboratory our feelings of guilt, apprehension, inferiority and insignificance. In fact they are domestic servants as truly the friend of man as are the dogs and horses he has fashioned from the raw material of animal species."²

A. C. Clarke is also of the same opinion and points out that people are applying their laws of the jungle to the world in which such laws simply do not exist.³

Some Western sociologists go to the other extreme, maintaining that robots will liberate man entirely from mental and physical work. Criticising this point of view, Norbert Wiener emphasised: "...The future offers very little hope for those who expect that our new mechanical slaves will offer us a world in which we may rest from thinking."⁴

The problem of "man and the machine" is becoming more acute in the capitalist world because the rapid development of computer technology is threatening mass unemployment not only for the factory worker but also for the mental worker. It has become particularly topical in the last few years when electronic machines have begun to be used increasingly widely in economic management. One now hears warnings about the undesirable social consequences of the "cybernetisation of society".

David L. Johnson of the University of Washington and Arthur L. Kobler, a Seattle psychologist, maintain, for example, that hasty introduction of computers in all spheres

¹ Robert M. Bowie, "The Information Science and Industry Fifty Years Hence", *Proceedings of the IRE*, p. 610.

² W. Grey Walter, *The Living Brain*, New York, 1953, p. 276.

³ A. C. Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

⁴ Norbert Wiener, *God and Golem*, Cambridge, 1964, p. 73.

of human activity produces the tendency to hand over to them the solution of complex social problems which are equated, as it were, with ordinary technological problems, the tendency to avoid taking one's own decisions, to avoid responsibility, and gives rise to the psychological "adaptation" of one's own assessments to machine computations with dangerous oversimplification of complex sets of problems. Apart from this, the speed of operation of electronic devices is so fast that man does not have time to fully understand the results obtained and take the right decision in critical cases. "The need for caution," Johnson and Kobler conclude, "will be greater in the future. Until we can determine more perfectly what we want from the machines, let us not call on mechanised decision systems to act upon human systems without realistic human processing. As we proceed with the inevitable development of computers and artificial intelligence, let us be sure we know what we are doing."¹

Norbert Wiener also warns that we must not place our hopes on machines alone to solve the complex problems on which the fate of mankind may depend, for machines can take wrong, uncontrolled decisions. Although they are theoretically subject to human critical analysis, because of the tremendous speed at which they perform operations it may happen that analysis produces the necessary results long after the time when they could still influence the course of events. "Render unto man the things which are man's and unto the computer the things which are the computer's,"² the founder of cybernetics concludes.

In order to produce an "intelligent machine", a "machine sapiens", to quote A. C. Clarke, expensive improvement processes are required. This, according to a number of bourgeois scientists, confronts mankind with a moral question: on whose teaching is it best to spend money—teaching machines or teaching people? The American scientist P. J. van Heerden believes that in the next fifty years mankind will be faced with the need either to spend money on training machines to perform tirelessly in very demanding

¹ Quoted from Gilbert Burck, *The Computer Age and Its Potential for Management*, New York, Evanston and London, 1965, p. 140.

² Norbert Wiener, *op. cit.* p. 73.

jobs, or to educate children to have the satisfaction of achievement in the same. "I hope," concludes the author, "that it will not be difficult to choose in favour of mankind."¹

This problem advanced by van Heerden is yet another illustration of the blind alley in which the capitalist world finds itself when confronted by cybernetisation. In socialist society even the framing of such a question is radically different, because in determining the outlook for the development of cybernetics the main point of departure here is the requirements of society itself, which dictate the most rational direction for technological progress.

A. C. Clarke is perfectly right in saying that the use of "thinking machines" will free the human brain to concentrate on more difficult problems, on more complex creative work. Assessing the long-term prospects for the development of cybernetics, he argues that "machine sapiens" will become the friend of homo sapiens because "the higher the intellect, the stronger the urge to collaborate". In the more remote future Clarke foresees the birth of "machine sapiens" with an original manner of thinking, for example, protoplasmic cybernetic organisms, which can be programmed to attain certain aims.²

Clarke's ideas are supported by the forecasts of T. S. Gordon and Olaf Helmer, RAND Corporation experts, who attempted to define the main stages in future automation of production by questioning a large number of American specialists in automation and cybernetics.

Their examination of the "man and machine" problem touches not only upon the inter-relation between the individual and technology, but also on aspects which extend beyond the framework of actual material production, such as nature of work, social structure of society, and socio-economic relations as a whole.

The automation stages are presented as follows:³

¹ P. J. van Heerden, "Computers of the Future", *Proceedings of the IRE*, p. 621.

² Jean Marabini, *Les hommes du future. Utopies ou réalités de demain?* Paris, 1965, p. 190.

³ This table was appended in somewhat abridged form to the text of a translation of one of Jean Marabini's articles into Russian (see *Inostrannaya literatura*, 1967, No. 1, p. 24).

Complete control of air traffic.	1974
Automation of housework.	1975
Education becomes a pastime.	1975
Universal use of teaching machines.	1975
Automatic libraries.	1976
Rapid machine translation.	1979
Use of machines for automatic decision-taking	1979
Use of centralised electronic calculation units. . .	1980
Electronic invalid aids (radar for the blind). . .	1985
Automatic diagnosis of diseases	1985
Use of robots for housework	1988
Creation of a new language based on machine transla- tion	2000
Direct injection of information into the brain	2000
Automatic voting	2000
Motorways with automatic control	2000
Symbiosis between man and the electronic machine	2000

The conclusion reached by Norbert Wiener in his study of this problem is very interesting. He stated that machines could become our helpers "but at the cost of supreme demands upon our honesty and our intelligence".¹ In another of his works he writes that "the new development has unbounded possibilities for good and for evil".² No good can come of these new possibilities if they are assessed from the viewpoint of the market and monetary economy. It is essential to have a society based on human values other than buying and selling.³ As for the capitalist world, he takes the view that there the introduction of automatic machines "will produce an unemployment situation, in comparison with which the present recession and even the depression of the thirties will seem a pleasant joke."⁴ It is a fact that the automation and cybernetisation of production in modern capitalist society is not transforming capitalism, as many bourgeois sociologists and economists try to assure us, but on the contrary is creating the prerequisites for social revolution, by continuing to prepare the material conditions for replacing capitalist production relations by socialist ones.

¹ Norbert Wiener, op. cit., p. 69.

² Norbert Wiener, *Cybernetics or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*, New York, 1948, p. 37.

³ Ibid., pp. 43-45.

⁴ Norbert Wiener, *The Human Use of Human Beings*. Cybernetics and Society, London, 1954, p. 162.

Town planning, transport and communications

The rapid development of electronics and cybernetics and the astounding advance of science and technology in general, the beginning of the conquest of outer space, the quantitative and qualitative leap forward in the development of air, land, over water and underwater transport—all this has turned the problem of transport and communications into a complex socio-political factor greatly influencing the path of further scientific, technological and social progress.

Alongside this the problem of town planning has also grown considerably more complex. The growth of towns today exceeds considerably even the unprecedented growth of the world population as a whole. Millions upon millions of people are moving from the villages to the towns. Everywhere the area of urban development is spreading rapidly. The towns are concentrating an ever-growing section of the population within their limits not only in the economically developed but also in the developing countries. Many large towns in the northeast of the United States and the industrial areas of Western Europe and Japan practically converge upon one another to form huge "megapolises".

In a capitalist economy this uncontrolled process of urbanisation results in population concentration of unprecedented size: several million people concentrate on several dozens of square kilometres.

This, in its turn, gives rise to a number of new problems, such as providing accommodation for the millions of families flocking to the towns; slum clearance; supplying the towns with fresh water, the lack of which is becoming increasingly acute in many industrial areas throughout the world; fighting cardio-vascular, carcinogenic and nervous diseases caused by bad living conditions, atmospheric pollution, the pressure of work at modern factories and the pace of life in general in a modern town, and, finally, the fight against the rising crime rate—that dark shadow that falls on every town in the capitalist world.

It is small wonder that the question of the concrete prospects for finding homes for the thousands of millions of new inhabitants of our planet who will appear in the next few decades should attract the attention of Western scientists.

Here, again, we find two conflicting conceptions: those who are in favour of checking population growth advocate the

principle of disurbanisation, the arrangement of large towns in such a way as to give an increasingly large number of people the opportunity to live in their own small house with a small garden; their opponents argue that the present growth rate of world population and the now firmly established trends of urban development make disurbanisation unrealistic and predetermine the future development of towns in general and large towns in particular.

An indirect reflection of the first point of view can be found in the works of Fritz Baade who declares that by 2000, given the right conditions, a considerable number of families will be able to live in their own cottages with a small garden.¹ Among the supporters of the opposite viewpoint is the Greek architect Constantinos Doxiadis, head of the Centre for Ekistics (the science of human settlements) in the Athens Institute of Technology. He predicts that in many industrial regions big cities will eventually amalgamate and an increasingly large number of families will live in densely populated belts of urban development stretching for hundreds of kilometres.²

The famous American architect Frank Lloyd Wright suggests solving the problem of urban overpopulation by building huge 500-storey skyscrapers 1,600 metres high. The English engineer W. Frischmann proposes the construction of 850-storey blocks of flats, each of which would accommodate hundreds of thousands of town dwellers.³

In all the cases quoted, transport (particularly urban transport) could evidently cope satisfactorily only if there were some important qualitative advances. This question occupies a considerable place in nearly all the general works on scientific and technological forecasting. Proposals are made to split up the big cities into self-contained units, within which there would be local transport systems so that people spent as little time as possible on travelling.⁴ The prospects are assessed for "air buses", monorails, transport on air cushion, "moving ways" and freight and passenger rockets on inter-city and inter-continental routes.⁵

¹ F. Baade, *Der Wettlauf zum Jahre 2000*, Hamburg, 1960, p. 263.

² *Science News Letter*, Vol. 88, No. 19, November 6, 1965, p. 298.

³ *Science et Avenir*, March 1966, pp. 192, 193.

⁴ George Thomson, *The Foreseeable Future*, p. 54.

⁵ A. C. Clarke, *Profiles of the Future*, pp. 22-81.

Discussing the more long-term prospects, A. C. Clarke predicts that not later than 2050 man will learn to control gravity and then all means of transport will undergo a qualitative change.¹ Special attention, however, is paid to the prospects of "replacing" the means of transport by communications.

Norbert Wiener and A. C. Clarke agree that in the future there may be competition between transport agencies and communications firms. The appearance of large stereoscopic and stereophonic TV colour screens will allow people to "meet" one another at a distance or "visit" various places, experiencing fully the sensation of being there, which could reduce the need for travelling considerably. Moreover, the development of radio-video-telephonic and photo-telegraphic communications should help the public to pass on necessary information quickly and in private, which will also render some travelling superfluous.

The information "explosion"

No advances in the development of transport and communications, however, are capable in themselves of solving the catastrophically growing problem of the vast accumulation of information. In 1963 the number of published scientific works exceeded a million and in 1966 two millions, i.e., the growth rate of scientific research is ten times that of world population.² According to other statistics, the increase in the volume of scientific information is not rising so rapidly,³ but the fact that this process is developing in geometrical progression is not doubted by anyone. Since the present system of information storage and retrieval is incapable of dealing with this avalanche, Western scientists are talking about an impending "information crisis" and the need for an immediate radical reorganisation of the existing system to avoid undesirable consequences for the whole of mankind.

Most Western scientists, in referring to the "overloading" of information channels and increasing difficulty in retrieving and absorbing information (how many times have we

¹ A. C. Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

² D. Gabor, *Inventing the Future*, p. 158.

³ *Proceedings of the IRE*, pp. 608, 610, 626.

heard that doing new research is cheaper than hunting for information about research that has already been done!) see as the solution the cybernetisation of the whole system of information exchange by creating a closed circuit from machine to machine, which leaves man only the absolute minimum of information on the most important questions. This presupposes regulating the processes of information exchange, eliminating all sorts of "excesses", duplicating, etc., setting up a network of electronic information storage units, from which man himself and computing machines can retrieve without human intervention the data necessary for regulating social production.

It is from this point of view that the possibilities are assessed of extending frequency bands providing electrical communications, of using new wave guide systems and quantum electronics which open up good prospects for transmitting wide frequency bands over a long distance, using artificial communication satellites for radio and television and so on. John Cockroft believes that in the next few decades the widespread use of lasers, the modulated beam of which is capable of carrying a large volume of information, could lead to important advances in the sphere of communications. Isaac Asimov even suggests a plan for creating on one of Jupiter's satellites a grandiose system of computers operating on the principles of the super-conductivity of niobium and tantalum at the temperature of liquid helium transported from Jupiter by rockets. According to him, this would be a sort of nerve centre of a man-mastered solar system, a huge information storehouse which would help man to cope with the information flow on a cosmic scale.¹

One more aspect of the information problem which a number of Western scientists regard as capable of revolutionising our perception of data received is the development of the latent possibilities of the human brain. The American scientist George Haller points out that a human being has access to about four per cent of his neurons. "If we could bring the unused neurons 'into the circuit' as needed for thinking or information storage," he writes, "we might multiply our individual intelligences by 25."²

¹ Isaac Asimov, *A View from a Height*, pp.81-82.

² George L. Haller, "Our State of Mind in 2012 A. D.", *Proceedings of the IRE*, p. 626.

Amplified by understanding of the basic functions involved, "the physiological training of unusual brains may have results that are quite unforeseeable", writes W. Grey Walter.¹ The English physiologist does not think it likely that a new type of man will appear with, as it were, a super-brain. However, he believes that if a way is found of controlling mutation processes on earth, a type of person will eventually develop with a more highly organised brain.

Western scientists are much more worried about the social aspects of the information problem. Expressing his concern at the influence on the "whole system of civilised life" of the rapid development of communications, particularly radio and television, Grey Walter writes that probably the most ominous feature of mechanised civilisation is that the ludicrous devices demanded for entertainment do not lend themselves to two-way operation."² As a result man is gradually degenerating, turning into something like the spinal cord, fit only to receive instructions and coordinate reflexes, but not capable of creating an independent and original idea. A passive solitary child gazing at the screen of a television receiver amuses only itself—the need to gaze does not promote or evoke habits of creativeness or generosity.

The same idea is developed by A. C. Clarke. "...Our children spend a sixth of their waking lives glued to the cathode-ray tube," he writes. "We are becoming a race of watchers, not of doers." Paraphrasing the famous saying, Clarke concludes with "*Whom the Gods would destroy, they first give T. V.*"³

Such an argument is well-founded, without a doubt, for the use of the tremendous possibilities of radio and television in the world of private enterprise is distorted, one-sided and anti-social. As John Bernal so rightly points out, these means of communication are used in the West for propagating the ideas of the ruling élite which links itself with the interests of finance capital in order to support obsolete social orders.⁴

It is significant that many bourgeois scientists acknowledge

¹ W. Grey Walter, *The Living Brain*, New York, 1953, p. 275.

² *Ibid.*, p. 267.

³ A. C. Clarke, *Profiles of the Future*, p. 196.

⁴ *Quel avenir attend l'homme?*, p. 179.

this contradiction between scientific and technological potential and the socio-economic consequences of its exploitation in the capitalist world. But their thoughts turn, as a rule, not to the possibility of purposeful social transformation, but to "automatic" advances as a result of new scientific and technological progress. Thus, Fred Hoyle places great hopes on establishing links with civilisations on other planets, emphasising that twenty or thirty pages of ideas and information, such as data about the atom bomb fifty years ago, would be capable of turning the present-day world upside down, or even destroying it.¹

The exploration of outer space

Not a single author of general works published in the West on the future of the Earth and mankind can ignore the problem of the exploration of outer space. As has already been noted, for many Western scientists outer space has become something of a fetish: they link the solution of many pressing problems of our time, such as world population, mineral resources, information and even the social structure of future society with the prospects of conquering outer space, ignoring the possibilities of solving them in a shorter period here on earth.

One must not forget, of course, that the era of exploring outer space, which began on November 4, 1957 when the Soviet Union launched the first artificial earth satellite, is only in its initial phase. There can be no doubt that the development of space exploration will have an important influence on the development of science and the whole of social production.

The rapid growth of space research led RAND Corporation experts T. S. Gordon and Olaf Helmer to make the following forecasts in 1964 (after questioning specialists).

Manned rocket Moon landing	1970
Use of lasers in space communications	1970
Ten-man orbital station	1970
Reusable rockets	1975
Nuclear propelled rockets	1975
Temporary Moon base	1975
Manned flight round Mars and Venus	1978
Physical experiments in space	1981

¹ Fred Hoyle, *Of Man and Galaxies*, p. 59.

Establishment of permanent Moon bases . . .	1982
Landing on Mars	1985
Instrument launching outside the solar system	1986
Manufacture of material on the Moon	1990
Establishment of permanent stations on neighbouring planets	1990
Mass transport by ballistic rockets	1995
Landing on Jupiter	2020
Automated flight to Pluto	2023
Flight for several generations outside the solar system	2050
System of anti-gravitational propulsion . . .	2050

A. C. Clarke argues that space research will bring mankind a new flowering not only of science and technology, but of culture as a whole. He describes modern space research as "merely the trivial preliminaries to the age of discovery that is now about to dawn.... That age will provide the necessary ingredients for a renaissance...."¹ Clarke predicts that in the next century mankind will be able to use nuclear energy for space flights, so that travelling to the most remote planet in the solar system will not take more than a week. When the speed of spaceships is near to that of light (this, he estimates, will happen not later than the second half of the 21st century), it will take only five years to travel from Earth to the nearest star. In the more long-term prospects for studying worlds which are 100-1,000 light years behind the solar system, he thinks it possible to make use of anabiosis, or space "arks"—artificial planets where one generation of astronauts will be replaced by the next until they reach their goal. He even examines hypotheses which seem like pure fantasy at the present time: a change in the structure of space under the influence of gravitational fields, an increase in the speed of transportation up to the speed of light and even the possibility of reaching any point in outer space instantaneously. He adds, however, that man can never even grasp the scale of the universe.²

George Thomson, referring to the long-term prospects for conquering outer space, stresses that astronauts travelling at speeds close to that of light will probably experience a relative contraction of time. But in order to adapt to the considerable slowing-down of chemical and biological pro-

¹ A. C. Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 80, 119, 122.

cesses at such speeds a qualitatively new stage in the development of science will be required, for change in time-scale, in his opinion, would involve a corresponding change in mass as well, and therefore enormous added energy, i.e., catastrophic consequences which would be avoided only with the help of new physical discoveries.¹

The future for the conquest of outer space is linked with two problems: the possibility of astronauts visiting civilisations on other planets and the possibility of establishing interstellar radio communication.

American astronomers estimate that given an average life duration of 2,500 million years for the median civilisation and an average age of 7,500 million years for planets, we may be more advanced than approximately 50,000 worlds in the part of the universe nearest to us, but less civilised than 950,000 others. O. Struve believes that there is a million "twin-earths" in our galaxy. Nevertheless it will be difficult to find intelligent life there. According to another American scientist, there are only ten planet prone stars within 160 light-years, and astronauts will have to inspect thousands of stellar systems before they come upon an inhabited planet.²

Fred Hoyle also takes a pessimistic view of the possibility of a direct contact with civilisations on other planets. He argues that even if the speed of spaceships increased ten times over, it would still take 10,000 years to discover the nearest inhabited planet. The fact that no intelligent beings have so far visited Earth leads him to conclude that space travelling is simply impossible.³

Against this view, however, Professor Luyton of the University of Minnesota advances the hypothesis that the space between "hot" stars is filled with cold, completely invisible dwarf stars, on which various forms of life may also exist. Astronauts will meet a dark star-planet within one light-year.⁴

However, as many scientists point out, even within the confines of the solar system our knowledge of life on other planets is still extremely vague. D. Gabor argues, for example,

¹ George Thomson, *The Foreseeable Future*, pp. 88-89.

² O. Binder, *Riddles of Astronomy*, London, 1964, pp. 142, 150, 160, 172.

³ Fred Hoyle, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁴ O. Binder, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

that there are no forms of life on the other planets in the solar system and that astronauts will find nothing there but a passionate desire to return to their good, sweet Earth.¹

An increasingly large number of scientists in the West are attracted by the possibility of contacting civilisations on other planets by radio signals and laser beams. There even exist detailed projects of this kind, known under the names of Ozma and Star Search. Fred Hoyle thinks it will be possible to transmit an intelligible message as far as the nearest star, some four light years away, probably even farther.² A. C. Clarke believes that contact with extra-terrestrial civilisations will be established not later than 2030.³

The space forecasts of many bourgeois scientists are based on fantastic hypotheses, for example, that technically advanced civilisations are bound to destroy themselves after they have discovered nuclear energy.

This type of hypothesis about the inevitability of a nuclear catastrophe on a cosmic scale merely reflects lack of faith in the triumph of human reason when the obsolete social system has been abolished, an automatic transference of the contradictions of the capitalist world to outer space. One would rather share Fred Hoyle's bright hope that one day Earth people will make their contribution to "galactic culture" and be invited to the round table of the "Interstellar Club" where galactic problems are discussed.⁴

The influence of science on the spiritual life of mankind in the future

The idea that the natural and social sciences are today influencing people's minds, world outlook, moral and aesthetic consciousness as never before runs through all Western works dealing with the future of mankind.

Many eminent writers, scientists and public figures in the West are increasingly drawing attention to the growing divergence between the old culture of the "humanities" and the new culture which is growing up today as a product of

¹ D. Gabor, *Inventing the Future*, p. 157.

² Fred Hoyle, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

³ A. C. Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

⁴ O. Binder, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

the scientific and technological revolution. A corresponding lack of understanding and alienation is developing between the "two intelligentsias" belonging to each of these cultures. This, in their opinion, is fraught with serious consequences for mankind in the future.

The eminent French physicist Louis de Broglie urges people to overcome the alienation between the culture of those who are connected with science and technology and those who are called on not only to enrich the human cultural heritage of the past, but to create a new culture.¹

In a report delivered to the Royal Society in 1964 and entitled "Motives and Aims of the Scientist" Fred Hoyle attacked the so-called separate culture of the scientists. "In the early years of the century the second culture did not exist," he said. "There was then no sensible difference between the inspirations of the scientist and those of the musician, the writer, and the artist.... I believe it is potentially far more dangerous to science than it is to the humanities. The future ... will depend much more on the environment in which the scientist is called on to operate than it will on the scientist himself." He concludes: "I suspect that if there are two cultures, as I agree today there are, then tomorrow there will be no culture at all."²

This idea of Hoyle's reflects the social contradictions in the capitalist world, where the prevalence of a narrow business-like approach and the absence of creative ideas common to the whole of society frequently lead scientists to a kind of moral bankruptcy, to attempts to create their own "culture". As John Bernal has pointed out "the retreat to an ivory tower in science is in many cases simply an escape from the general meaninglessness and purposelessness of life in a world where the only prospect is destruction. Constructive social purpose carries with it emotional sanctions and satisfactions which we in this selfish civilisation have lost much to our detriment."³

Grey Walter sees the narrow specialisation of scientists and technologists as yet another danger to the future of mankind—the spiritual impoverishment of scientists and

¹ See A. A. Zvorykin, *Philosophy and Progress in Science and Technology*, Moscow, 1965, pp. 44, 45 (in Russian).

² Fred Hoyle, *op cit.*, pp. 21, 24.

³ J. D. Bernal, *Science in History*, London, 1954, p. 902.

a hostile attitude towards them on the part of all those who are not directly connected with science and technology. "Continuation of the sectarian process of specialisation could only lead to one result, the creation of an irresponsible scientific priesthood, preoccupied entirely with its liturgy and its mysteries; and, in due course, to a popular revulsion from scientific knowledge and a slump of scientific credit that would usher in a dark age as vicious and prolonged as the aftermath of an atomic war," he writes.¹

The English scientist A. Standon also writes with great alarm about the turning of science into a "sacred cow". He notes that it is necessary to bar the way of abusing the might of science, the conversion of people into nonentities and the adaptation of them to some scientific-synthetic happiness.²

Developing the same idea, the well-known French writer Vercors in an address at a conference in Royaumont expressed the fear that under the influence of modern science and technology a "practical ethic" would prevail capable of "enclosing" human intelligence in itself, in an immense contentment with itself which could lead us, one day, to a new savageness of the spirit. "...The need for limiting research to increasingly narrow fields is already leading many young researchers to shut themselves up in their specialities ... to despise the other spiritual activities.... This is already resulting in a number of fields in the beginning of sclerosis, the suffocation of research."³

The problem of the "two cultures", the contradictions between science and bourgeois culture, the danger of succeeding generations turning against science and the threat for mankind of falling into spiritual savagery are indeed becoming increasingly urgent problems in capitalist society. As one of the clearest manifestations of the social contradictions rending this society, the growing feeling of protest against the spiritual impoverishment which is spreading to wider and wider sectors of the bourgeois intelligentsia is becoming an important factor in the ideological struggle, a factor which is undermining the ideological foundations of the capitalist world.

¹ W. Grey Walter, *The Living Brain*, New York, 1953, p. 275.

² A. Standon, *Science Is a Sacred Cow*, New York, 1959, p. 221.

³ *Quel avenir attend l'homme?* pp. 302-03.

Chapter 2

SOME PROBLEMS OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING IN THE USSR

Only scientific communism, which links the solving of the problems confronting mankind with the elimination of obsolete social orders and the building of a new, communist society, is capable of organically connecting scientific and technological forecasting with socio-economic forecasting.

The achievements of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and other countries have proved in practice the accuracy of Marxist socio-economic forecasting.

All this together with the advances of modern science as a whole has created immense possibilities both for concrete technological forecasting and socio-economic forecasting. The latest mathematical theories and the most recent advances in cybernetics, computer technology and statistics processing—all these products of the scientific and technological revolution help us to look increasingly further into the future, to forecast with increasing accuracy to make the future an object of concrete sociological research in the same way as the past and present. At the same time, with the modern pace of scientific and technological advance, the efficient development of the national economy and culture is inconceivable without detailed forecasts of the future. Thus, scientific prediction acquires an enormous practical significance.

The programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the programmatic documents of the fraternal Communist parties and international meetings summarise the prospects for the development of the world socialist system, the international working-class and the national liberation movements. This constitutes the basis for detailed forecasting of the development of individual branches of the national economy and culture—from industry and agriculture to public health and education systems.

At the 23rd and 24th Congresses of the CPSU the need was stressed for putting long-term planning on an all-round scientific basis and it was pointed out that this referred not only to the planning of the economy, but to that of social relations and culture in the very broadest sense. Hence

the problem arises of working out the theoretical bases for long-term planning, the methodology of concrete technological and socio-economic forecasting.

Leonid Brezhnev said at the 24th CPSU Congress: "This raises the question of planning national-economic development over a long term, on the basis of forecasts of the country's population growth, the requirements of national economy, and scientific and technical progress. This approach, ensuring constant coordination of long-term plans with five-year and annual plans, helps in the more effective solution of the basic problems of our development."¹

Research in this sphere demands close coordination between economists, sociologists, philosophers, demographers, mathematicians, physicists, chemists, biologists, geographers, and specialists in the technical, agricultural, pedagogical and other sciences.

Forecasting in the Soviet Union rests on the progressive traditions of Russian and world science. The first steps in this field were linked with the names of great thinkers, for example, if one takes Russian scholars, the names of Mendeleev, Tsiolkovsky, Sechenov, Pavlov, Mechnikov, Timiryazev, Zhukovsky, Vernadsky and many others.

Dmitri Mendeleev made a most important contribution to the development of scientific forecasting by discovering the periodic law, on the basis of which he predicted the properties of a number of chemical elements unknown at that time. To his pen also belong works on such scientific and technological problems, well in advance of his age, as the subterranean gasification of coal, the pipeline transport and location of oil refineries, the use of such constant natural sources of energy as the sun, wind and rivers. "In the future," we read in one of his works, "one can foresee the time when the obtaining of mechanical force will take place without the expenditure of fuel, with the help of natural, or free, forces dispersed all round us."² He paid particular attention to the prospects for utilising the sea's food resources and to the production of synthetic food. "As a chemist," he wrote, "I am convinced of the possibility of obtaining

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 80.

² D. I. Mendeleev, *Problems of Russia's Economic Development*, Moscow, 1960, p. 245 (in Russian).

nutritious substance from a combination of the elements of air, water and earth in addition to normal culture, i.e., at special workshops and factories, but the need for this is very remote as yet, because there is still a great deal of empty land everywhere..."¹

Konstantin Tsiolkovsky examined concrete ways of exploring outer space and investigated the basic future problems of conquering the space (the principles of multi-stage rockets using liquid propellants, apparatus based on solar energy, artificial earth satellites, etc.) right up to building artificial planets—"ethereal towns". All his predictions in this sphere have so far been substantiated with remarkable precision. One of his last forecasts concerning the conquest of space reads as follows: "I am firmly convinced that my other dream—interplanetary travel ... will also become reality. For forty years I worked on jet propulsion and thought that a trip to Mars would begin only many centuries from now. But time limits are changing. I believe that many of you will witness the first journey outside the earth's atmosphere."²

Tsiolkovsky's predictions on utilising the earth's surface are less well known.³ Naturally, there is much in his detailed scientific and technological conceptions of the future which no longer fits in with modern science and a number of his statements of a socio-economic and philosophical nature have not stood up to Marxist criticism. But many of his concrete scientific and technological forecasts—from the idea of trains on an air cushion to that of floating artificial islands—continue to be of extreme interest in our day.

I. M. Sechenov and I. P. Pavlov anticipated the achievements of modern cybernetics in their works, pointing to the possibility of machine simulation of certain brain functions, i.e., to the fact that processes, from a certain point of view,

¹ D. I. Mendeleyev, *Writings on Agriculture and Forestry*, Moscow, 1954, p. 607 (in Russian).

² Quoted from V. I. Igumnov, *To Distant Worlds*, Moscow, 1965, p. 11 (in Russian).

³ See K. E. Tsiolkovsky, *The Future of the Earth and Mankind*, Kalgula, 1928. A number of works in this cycle have been published in K. E. Tsiolkovsky's *Collected Works* (Moscow, 1964, Vol. IV) and in the collection of his writings entitled *The Way to the Stars*, Moscow, 1961 (in Russian).

functionally equivalent, take place in the brain and in a machine. "All external manifestations of brain activity may be reduced to muscular movement," wrote Sechenov. "For in the case of a musician and of a sculptor the hand which creates life is capable of performing only purely mechanical movements which, strictly speaking, may be subjected to mathematical analysis and expressed as a formula."¹ "...All life from the simplest to the most complex organisms, including man, of course, is a long series of ever-increasing to the highest degree equilibrations of the external environment," wrote Pavlov, developing the same idea. "There will come a time—albeit remote—when mathematical analysis, based on that of the natural sciences, will embrace all these equilibrations with the majestic formulae of equations...."² Today these ideas are gradually becoming reality. The development of mathematical logic and cybernetics is making it possible to create logical electronic systems in biology and medicine.

The writings of Ivan Mechnikov collected in his books *The Nature of Man* and *Studies in Optimism* played an important role in developing modern ideas of the physical make-up of the man of the future. K. A. Timiryazev's discovery of the energy law of the photosynthesis of plants paved the way for forecasting concrete prospects for utilizing mankind's food resources. The works of N. A. Umov stimulated the study of a number of future problems in information theory. The father of Russian aviation, N. Y. Zhukovsky, who produced some most interesting ideas on the possibility of developing jet-propelled vessels and flying machines heavier than air as early as the end of the last century, was one of the founders of scientific forecasting in the field of air transport. The founder of geo-chemistry and radio-geology, V. I. Vernadsky, stressed the paramount importance of consciousness, science and humane intellect in directing the process of the interaction of nature and society. "Sources of energy have come to light," he wrote as far back as 1910, "against which the power of steam, the power of electricity and the power of explosive chemical substances

¹ Quoted from A. I. Berg, *Cybernetics—the Science of Optimal Control*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1964, p. 10 (in Russian).

² I. P. Pavlov, *Complete Works*, Vol. III, Book 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1951, pp. 124-25 (in Russian).

pale in strength and importance. We, children of the twentieth century, have grown used to the power of steam and electricity all around us. We know how profoundly they have changed and are changing the whole social structure of human society and, moreover, how deeply they are changing the more trivial everyday environment of the human personality.... But now, in the phenomena of radioactivity, sources of atomic energy are opening up which exceed millions of times over all the sources of energy which have ever suggested themselves to the human imagination."¹

In the twenties and early thirties, under the direct influence of Lenin and in close conjunction with long-term socialist planning, research in the sphere of social forecasting assumed considerable proportions in the Soviet Union. Many Soviet scientists took an active part in discussion of the principle of economic planning, and the country's scientific community directed its efforts towards solving the problems of the first Soviet five-year plans. Interesting long-term forecasts were made by G. M. Krzhizhanovsky and A. V. Vinter (fuel and energy), A. F. Ioffe (the possibility of utilising thermo-elements), A. L. Chizhevsky (the effect of solar activity on the human organism; the fundamentals of space biology and space physiology), L. M. Sabsovich and N. L. Meshcheryakov (town planning), and others.

The first Soviet collective work on social forecasting, *The Life and Technology of the Future* appeared in 1928.

One need only compare this work with similar works of the same period in the West, which were discussed in the previous section, to see how favourably it differs from most of them in many respects. The first All-Union Scientific Planning Conference attended by A. F. Ioffe, A. N. Frumkin, S. I. Vavilov and a number of other eminent Soviet scientists, was held in 1930. This conference also demonstrated the high scientific level of Soviet forecasting.

In 1935, under G. M. Krzhizhanovsky the first research on the problem of "Electric Power Development in the USSR" was carried out at the Electric Power Institute. This work provided the basis for a number of important technico-

¹ Quoted from G. M. Dobrov, A. Y. Golyan-Nikolsky, *The Age of Great Hopes*, Kiev, 1964, p. 7 (in Russian).

economic and socio-economic forecasts. At the end of that year Maxim Gorky proposed a multi-volume publication devoted to the results of the first two five-year plans. One of its volumes entitled *A Glimpse Into the Future* was to contain a detailed technological and socio-economic forecast of the country's development for the next twenty or thirty years. Soviet specialists in science, literature and the arts, including Academician A. N. Bakh, the writer Leonid Leonov and the film director Alexander Dovzhenko, took part in preparing this volume.

In the last few years research in the sphere of social forecasting has become particularly extensive, concurrently and in close connection with the scientific and technological revolution which provides scientists with the essential material and methods for efficient forecasting. Things that were inconceivable fifty or twenty-five years ago (for example, detailed research on prospects for developing the world's energy and raw material base, industry, agriculture, transport, communications, demographic processes, town planning, labour and living conditions) are now becoming possible for large research units equipped with the latest advances in science and computer technology and a carefully worked out methodology.

There is a large number of articles by many Soviet scientists on problems of forecasting. Special works on this subject have been written by A. I. Berg, V. M. Glushkov, M. V. Keldysh, B. M. Kedrov, V. A. Kirillin, B. G. Kuznetsov, M. D. Millionshchikov, A. N. Nesmeyanov, A. M. Rumyantsev, N. N. Semyonov, V. I. Siforov, S. G. Strumilin, V. A. Trapeznikov, E. K. Fyodorov, P. N. Fedoseyev, T. S. Khachaturov, I. S. Shklovsky, D. I. Shcherbakov and many other Soviet specialists.¹

There are still many unsolved problems and insufficiently studied questions in social forecasting. Consequently, it is only natural that among Soviet scientists views occasionally differ on a number of problems, that mistaken or debatable hypotheses are criticised.

¹ See M. V. Vasilyev and S. Z. Gushcheyev, *Report From the 21st Century*, Moscow, 1958; G. M. Dobrov, A. Y. Golyan-Nikolsky, *The Age of Great Hopes*; I. V. Lada, O. N. Pisarzhevsky, *Outlines of the Future*, Moscow, 1965; *The Future of Science*, Books 1-4, Moscow, 1966-71 (in Russian).

Soviet social forecasting, however, is fundamentally different from Western forecasting, because, firstly, it is based on the theory of scientific communism, developing its theses in various concrete aspects and, thus, standing in antithesis to the diverse and contradictory bourgeois theories of the future as an integrated logically complete system of views. Secondly, Marxist-Leninist theory makes it possible to link organically the socio-economic and technological aspects of forecasting, avoiding the contradictions between the two frequently found in the West. Thirdly, because of the nature of socialist economy the forecasts of Soviet scientists are closely connected with state long-term planning of the national economy and culture.

Let us now examine a number of important problems of scientific and technological forecasting in the USSR.

The prospects of the world fuel and raw material balance

One of the essential differences between Soviet and Western scientific forecasts is that Soviet scientists unanimously and categorically reject all theories of a future "energy shortage" and "raw material shortage", as absolutely unfounded. Although they may vary in their assessments of the potential energy and raw material resources of our planet and the solar system in general, they all agree that these resources by and large are practically unlimited and fully capable of ensuring the further progress of mankind in the foreseeable future.

According to Academician M. A. Styrikovich, total world consumption of all types of energy is at present doubling every twenty years. World consumption of electric power, on which about one quarter of all energy resources is spent, is growing even faster: in twenty years it increases four times over.¹ Will the energy resources at present at mankind's disposal suffice to maintain these rates? Soviet power experts reply to this question in the affirmative. "Thermonuclear energy," wrote Academician I. V. Kurchatov, "is the basis of the energy of the future.... Simple calculations show that there is enough deuterium as a fuel on earth to last for hundreds of millions of years with the most rapid power develop-

¹ *The Future of Science*, p. 56.

ment. With the creation of thermonuclear reactors the worry about fuel will disappear practically for ever."¹

An abundance of cheap electric power will ensure the completion of the comprehensive automation of social production, make possible large-scale freshening of sea-water, utilisation of arid and polar regions, and control of the earth's climate for the benefit of man; in brief, it will be one of the important pre-conditions for creating the material and technical basis of future communist society. Incidentally, the illusory nature of the danger of a "power shortage" makes the danger of a "raw material shortage" equally illusory, since the degree of utilisation of existing sources of raw materials depends in the final analysis simply on the amount of energy which we can spend on extracting and processing these raw materials. In this sense the sources of raw materials are practically as unlimited as the sources of energy.

Of course, the reserves of comparatively shallow-lying prolific deposits of raw materials have been exhausted for the most part. It has been calculated, for example, that given the existing world extraction rate of iron ore (which doubles every ten years) known reserves will last for only another 100-150 years. The situation is even worse with non-ferrous metals, particularly such common ones as copper and tin: in this case known reserves will last for only 20-30 years.² However, firstly, these statistics refer only to comparatively shallow deposits; secondly, they concern ores with a comparatively rich metal content; and, thirdly, the very concept of "mineral deposits" is being framed in a fundamentally different way.

Evidently the processing of deep-lying deposits not rich in metal will make it possible to increase mankind's raw material resources by several powers. (Naturally, this applies not only to ore but to all other mineral resources.) In order to develop the extraction of raw materials on a similar scale all that will be needed is the improvement of extraction techniques and a sufficient amount of energy.

¹ *Pravda*, February 28, 1958.

² *Statistical Yearbook UN*, 1960, p. 142; *The Iron Ore Base of the Soviet Ferrous Metal Industry*, Moscow, 1957, p. 66 (in Russian); W. Van Royen, *Mineral Resources of the World*, New York, 1952, p. 5.

With this abundance of cheap energy the whole of the earth's crust could turn into "mineral deposits".

Academician D. I. Shcherbakov estimates that if metal can be extracted from rock (from granite and shales, for example, which is perfectly feasible from the technical point of view), each cubic kilometre of these new raw material resources with their colossal scope would yield 230 million tons of aluminium, 130 million tons of iron, 260,000 tons of tin, 7,000 tons of uranium, 13 tons of gold and several tons of other metals. And if a technique were found for extracting metals from basalt, which forms the lower layer of the earth's crust, each 100 tons of this raw material would yield 15 tons of aluminium, 6 tons of iron, 5 tons of magnesium, 2 tons of titanium, etc. All in all, the earth's crust for 16 kilometres below the surface contains trillions (10^{17-18}) of tons of different metals. This makes it difficult to even envisage a level of production at which mankind would begin to experience a shortage in metals.¹

All this does not apply to metals only. The rapid development of synthetic materials is also to a considerable extent connected with the growth of the energy base. According to Academician N. N. Semyonov, given the existing rates of polymer production it will be comparable to the present scale of metal smelting in a few decades. All that is needed for this is 5-6 per cent of the present world extraction of oil.² The raw material base of polymer production also includes coal, natural gases, peat, and such an abundantly available raw material as wood, the annual world increase in which is 2,500,000 cubic metres, with utilisation only slightly exceeding $\frac{2}{3}$ of this amount.³

Soviet scientists hold that there are grounds for assuming that the nuclear age will also be the age of synthetic materials with qualities programmed in advance, materials obtained from the colossal reserves of organic, and eventually also the practically limitless reserves of inorganic, raw material. "The prospects for the chemical sciences and the chemical industry are boundless," Academician V. A. Kargin pointed

¹ I. V. Lada, O. N. Pisarzhevsky, *The Outline of the Future*, p. 128.

² *Vestnik AN SSSR*, No. 2, 1959, p. 48; *Pravda*, January 8, 1958.

³ *Nauka i zhizn*, No. 12, 1960, p. 72; *Statistical Yearbook UN*, 1960, p. 120.

out. "It is they who will provide mankind with an inexhaustible source of new materials, and select the keys to a treasure store from which people will derive everything they need for agriculture and industry, building and everyday life, technology and scientific research. This is the true conquest of nature."¹

Automation and cybernetisation of social production as a new stage in the development of productive forces

Up to the present time two main trends closely connected with each other have crystallised in the process of automation of social production. The first is the actual automation of production processes (automated machine tools, machine-tool lines, workshops and automated factories which basically ensure higher productivity of physical work). The second is the development and improvement of cybernetic machines which basically ensure a higher productivity of brain work. The latter trend, which appeared comparatively recently and is a qualitative leap forward in the process of automation, is called cybernetisation by Academician A. I. Berg.

Many Soviet scientists are of the opinion that the future of automation will be determined to a large extent by the extension of the use of cybernetic machines, which are able not only to carry out the production process, but also to take part in controlling it.

Only some twenty years have passed since the time computers began to be used in production, but their rapid introduction into the most varied branches of economy has revealed that these machines may be utilised universally as devices capable in principle of transforming any information which man encounters in all the spheres of his activity. This ensures the automation of those spheres of production which have always demanded the direct participation of the human intellect. Moreover, computers have turned out to be a universal means for automating not only brain work (to say nothing of physical work), but of highly-qualified brain work. "Essentially," writes Academician V. M. Glushkov, "the second technological revolution is

¹ Quoted from I. V. Lada, O. N. Pisarzhevsky, *The Outline of the Future*, p. 144.

taking place before our eyes. The first revolution of this kind, which affected the sphere of physical labour, was due to the creation of the engine thereby increasing mankind's physical power. Now, however, we are witnessing the birth of universal automats which will help to augment mankind's intellectual power to an unlimited extent."¹

The present level of cybernetic development makes it possible to create a comprehensive automation system for planning complex technical projects. Computers are capable of producing programmes on magnetic tape for machine tools and automated lines, bypassing the engineer and designer, without any blueprints. This results in a vast saving of technical labour. It is, moreover, becoming an urgent necessity; with the present rate of scientific and technological progress and the ever-increasing volume of information, the whole population of the Soviet Union would be insufficient to solve scientific and design construction problems alone in twenty years' time without cybernetic machines.

These features of cybernetic machines are making it possible to revolutionise the whole process of social production. The application of cybernetics in industry is creating (given the right social conditions) the prerequisites for smoothing over the distinctions between brain work and physical work in the next 20-30 years. The energy of the future is quite inconceivable without a centralised system of cybernetic machines automatically maintaining an optimal operational regime for a single network of electric power stations. The same applies to maintaining an optimal operational regime for a centralised transport and communications network in the future. Cybernetics is also called upon to play an important role in the automation of agriculture which is just beginning, particularly, in solving the problems of controlling the weather and climate. Cybernetic machines will also be used extensively in the sphere of public health: in the near future the whole population of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries will periodically undergo a medical examination the results of which will be translated into computer language and then, in the form of magnetic and perforated tape, be processed by diagnostic machines capable of discovering deviations from the nor-

¹ *The Future of Science*, p. 134.

mal development of the human organism and diagnosing the disease. In the sphere of public education and culture by the end of this century cybernetic machines will be able to translate efficiently from one language to another, and will become (in the form of teaching and examining machines) indispensable helpers for teachers in educational establishments. Finally, without "intelligent machines" it is difficult to imagine the future of space research: practically all the large space operations—from exploration of other planets in the solar system to establishing contact with other civilisations—are conceivable only given a high level of automation and cybernetics.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are now faced with the task of automating the planning and management of the national economy. This, too, is impossible without the extensive use of cybernetic machines. By 1980 the Soviet Union is planning to put into operation several thousands of automated systems for the control of factories and whole branches of industry. In addition, some hundreds of computer information centres are to be set up, on the basis of which a single state network of computer centres will be established to provide all calculations on the optimal planning and economic management.¹ The single state network of computer centres will be composed of the main centre performing the function of control of the whole system, several dozen primary centres and the ground network. The primary computer centres will deal with individual problems of economic planning and management and draw up optimal branch plans. Communication lines will be established between the primary centres to link the branch plans into a single national economic plan.

"In contrast to capitalism," says the CPSU Programme, "the planned socialist system of economy combines accelerated technical progress with the full employment of all able-bodied citizens. Automation and comprehensive mechanisation serve as a material basis for the gradual development of socialist labour into communist labour."²

Soviet scientists are paying special attention to the automation of research work. This applies not only to automation

¹ A. I. Berg, *Cybernetics, the Science of Optimal Management*, pp. 37-41.

² *The Road to Communism*, pp. 513-14.

of various types of calculations carried out in the course of research, but also to automation of information and synopsis work. It will not be long before we have automation of experiments and studies with constant processing of the data under investigation in nuclear physics, stellar astronomy, hydro- and aero-mechanics and a number of other sciences.

In the opinion of Academician V. M. Glushkov, the most interesting aspect will be automated proof of theorems within the framework of various deductive theories and constructions of theoretical systems generalising the results of experiments. The prospects in this sphere are very impressive.

It is well known that the "capacity" of the brain places a certain limit on the complexity of the theories and proofs created by it. Cases are already being encountered where the solution of a particular problem in mathematics or theoretical physics would require several decades of intense brain work by a researcher. The use of machines, if only for partial automation of this type of work, will make it possible not only to reduce the time it takes to solve complicated problems, but also to construct theories of a complexity which is practically inaccessible to man at the present time.¹

The widespread view in the West that the emergence of such complex self-teaching cybernetic machines, capable of organising their own activity, will lead to the subjugation of man by machines, to people becoming their slaves or to the annihilation of mankind by them, is refuted by Soviet science as an ill-founded speculation engendered by the automatic transference of the ways of the capitalist world to a world of a completely different kind, totally incompatible with the capitalist one.

Population and food resources

Future problems of world population growth have been an object of lively scientific discussion for several years now among Soviet scientists. In the course of this discussion

¹ V. M. Glushkov, "Cybernetics and Economic Management" in *Expected and Unexpected Cybernetics*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 150-51 (in Russian).

various points of view have been expressed. However, all Soviet demographers are unanimous in refuting Malthusian and neo-Malthusian theories of population growth which are still found to this very day in Western scientific and publicistic literature. Academician S. G. Strumilin makes a detailed analysis of the mechanism of modern demographic processes, which, in his opinion, can be reduced to the fact that with the growth of longevity (given a high material and cultural standard of living) in the economically developed countries there is a drop in the birth rate, and when the drop in the birth rate is not compensated for by a drop in the death rate, the general growth of the population slows down.¹

In their criticism of neo-Malthusian theories, Soviet demographers proceed from Karl Marx's famous thesis that specific laws of population growth are inherent in each mode of production.

The present law of the increase in world population (which has been operating for at least a few hundred years) is conditioned not so much by biological as by social factors. By overcoming social crises mankind can ensure "normal" population growth, determining the size of the annual increase in a sensible way.²

Under the communist mode of production mankind will be able to determine the most rational rate of population growth, using its own discretion or, to be more precise, this rate will be determined by social development in the age of communism—this is the general conclusion reached by Soviet demographers. It is confirmed by the thesis, a fundamental one in this respect, of Frederick Engels who, in reply to Karl Kautsky's statements on the possibility of over-population under communism, wrote: "The abstract possibility that the number of people will grow so large that limits will have to be placed on its increase certainly exists. Should a communist society, however, find itself compelled to regulate the production of people in the same way as it has already regulated the production of things, it will be this society and this alone which will carry it out without difficulties."³

¹ S. G. Strumilin, *Our World in 20 Years' Time*, Moscow, 1964, p. 6 (in Russian).

² I. S. Shklovsky, *The Universe. Life. Reason*, pp. 250-51.

³ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 35, S. 151.

This does not mean, of course, that in a socialist society the population problem is solved automatically, requiring neither special study nor a scientifically based policy on these questions, a policy grounded on concrete social studies. "Firmly rejecting all panic-stricken notions about the prospect of 'impending over-population'," says the Soviet demographer, B. Ts. Uralnis, "Marxist demographers should also beware of the superficial approach in which people place their hopes entirely on scientific advance and totally ignore population problems."¹

Efficient study of population problems, stresses Professor D. I. Valentei, is possible only if it extends to philosophy, sociology, political economy, economic geography, history, population statistics, law, social psychology, town planning and architecture, ethnography and anthropology, medicine and physiology. Such a base can only be provided by a special science of population study, which, in active conjunction with other sciences, is required to formulate a scientifically planned population policy in society.²

Soviet scientists are equally unanimous in rejecting the second part of neo-Malthusian doctrine—the inevitability of a growing shortage of food resources in the future.

Their optimism in this respect—if one is speaking of long-term prospects extending beyond the framework of the "traditional" methods of increasing productivity in crop-growing and animal-farming—is based not only on the theoretically unlimited possibilities for producing food-stuffs, but also on the practical achievements in a number of branches of modern science.

One of these branches is connected with the problem of producing synthetic food.

"Whereas at the IX Mendeleyev Congress (1965) the problem of creating synthetic food was raised basically as an academic one," notes Academician A. N. Nesmeyanov, "today it has acquired the appearance of a branch of science which is being actively developed. The questions that need to be dealt with have been elaborated and some of them solved already, such as obtaining amino acids and proteins from non-nutritious raw material, obtaining certain food

¹ B. Ts. Uralnis, "Do Population Problems Exist?", *Literaturnaya gazeta*, November 23, 1965.

² D. I. Valentei, "Science and Population", *Pravda*, June 27, 1966.

structures and creating high-quality imitations of food smells."¹ Nesmeyanov believes that the industrial production of protein and amino acids by chemical and microbiological synthesis is the best way of increasing food resources, particularly proteins, which are the most valuable and in short supply. Modern cattle farming, he writes, gives man in meat from 15 to 20 per cent of the protein, consumed by the animals in their fodder (and up to 30 per cent in milk). The greater part of the protein contained in the fodder is used up by the animal itself. However, it is possible to extract practically all the protein in pure form from any fodder, turning it into appetising, good quality food in the usual form, that is, to increase the production of protein straightaway by 3-6 times. What is more, pure microbiological protein, as also pure synthetic amino acids, can be kept at room temperature for an indefinite period without losing their qualities. The use of nitrogen and phosphorus is also far more economical in microbiological than in agricultural production of protein.²

Nesmeyanov takes the view that in the future the economics of food synthesis (and the quality of that food) may prevail over food obtained in the traditional way. If this is the case a few factories running on coal or oil will be capable of producing food to meet the requirements of the whole population, and labour-consuming agriculture will become a thing of the past. The old food industry will be replaced by a new, far more compact industry. Mankind will no longer suffer the tremendous food losses caused by bad weather, natural disasters, pests, decay and other evils which spoil a considerable part of the harvest at the present time. Occupations linked with the domestic preparation of food will die out and housewives will be released from their burdensome tasks: packaged synthetic food, ready-to-eat and similar to tinned foods, but unlike many of the latter full of vitamins and most appetising, will require at the very most simply heating. This food will also ensure a balanced diet; it will be easier to meet the special dietary requirements to ensure individual health. Finally, pastureland will be replaced by forests and parks, tourist and recreation zones

¹ A. N. Nesmeyanov et al., "Artificial and Synthetic Food", *Vestnik AN SSSR*, No. 1, 1969.

² Ibid.

will be extended, and the problem of fresh water, which is becoming increasingly acute, will be solved because the process by which the rivers are drying up and becoming shallow as the area of arable land increases and the forests shrink will come to an end.¹

There is yet another scientific trend capable of contributing greatly towards a solution of the problem of man's food resources. This is connected with a special branch of biophysics, namely, bioenergetics which studies the conversion of energy in biogeocenoses (interconnected systems of plants, animals, micro-organisms, soils and the contiguous layer of the atmosphere). The general mathematical law determining energy loss in biological complexes has been discovered. The main task of the bioenergetisists is to increase the intensity of the synthesis of the biomass on the earth's surface. The "reserve" of increase lies in the fact that the solar energy reaching the earth's surface is used extremely inefficiently. By means of photosynthesis plants accumulate on average only one per cent of the solar energy reaching them, whereas in theory up to 28 per cent of solar energy absorbed could be used in photosynthesis. Thus, the "efficiency coefficient" of plants (and, consequently, of crop growing and cattle farming) could be increased many dozens of times over.²

The town of the future.

Transport and communications prospects

The problem of the rational distribution of the population in the future is closely connected with that of population growth. In their time Marx, Engels and Lenin stated that the new socialist mode of production would inevitably give rise to new principles of population settlement putting an end to both rural backwardness and isolation, and to the unnatural accumulation of huge masses in large towns. Present development in the socialist countries is moving in this direction. On the one hand, in the planned reconstruc-

¹ A. N. Nesmeyanov, V. M. Belikov, *The Problem of Food Synthesis*, Moscow, 1965, pp. 23-24 (in Russian).

² V. R. Volobuyev, "Bioenergetics and Its Tasks", *Vestnik AN SSSR*, No. 4, 1969.

tion of large towns the over-populated centres will gradually be relieved. On the other hand, the villages are to be turned into townships with all amenities and residential blocks of the urban type. With the growth of new towns and the development of new regions the population will gradually become more evenly distributed over the whole country.

The CPSU Programme envisages a rational and comprehensive organisation of industrial zones, residential areas, public and cultural institutions, communal services, transport, engineering equipment and power sources ensuring the best possible conditions for labour, life and leisure.¹ In this connection forecasts are being prepared in the sphere of town planning and general development plans are being drawn up on their basis for Moscow and other Soviet cities for the period up to 2000-2070.

It is only logical that future building and architectural problems should also be the subject of widespread discussion in the Soviet Union. Here also the variety of views expressed by the participants is combined with a unanimous rejection of two town planning principles which are popular in the West. On the one hand, Soviet architects, sociologists and economists reject the theory of disurbanisation, in the belief that the mass building of individual houses is not only economically unjustified (slower provision of homes, higher construction costs, complications in the utilisation of accommodation, communications, etc.), but also unacceptable for a socialist society on principle (since the one-family house assumes the continuance of housework, the "slaving away" of the wife or the hiring of servants, fragments the community into separate units, and strengthens the private ownership mentality). On the other hand, there is an equally categorical rejection of the conception of vast built-up areas, the "megalopolis" with its extreme over-population, mixing of residential and industrial zones, violation of elementary sanitation and hygiene standards, etc.

By their discussions Soviet architects are solving the problem of the best possible town, residential area, estate and accommodation. In this case the concept of the "best possible" does not imply a single standardised model; designs

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 541.

for the construction of new towns and houses can and should vary depending on local conditions. The only essential requirement is that in each specific case every effort should be made to attain the maximum degree of convenience for the inhabitants with regard to travel to their places of work and to proximity of cultural and community amenities and to sanitation and hygiene, including greenery and clean air. Thus, if we are to speak of a single doctrine of town planning in the socialist countries, the closest approximation to it is man's eternal dream of the "garden city".

"Scientific forecasting in town planning," notes the architect V. A. Shkvarikov, "does not mean attempting to sketch a theoretically abstract model, but tracing as far ahead as possible the development of the towns of the present, insofar as the creation of towns in the near and distant future in the stages of communist construction will continue on their basis. A general scientific aim is the elaboration of a theoretical basis for the development of systems and forms of population settlement and the architectural and planning structure of towns in the stages of communist construction, which are intended to comply with social and technological progress and create the best possible environment for the labour, social activity, leisure and everyday life of the Soviet people."¹

"The town of the communist future," writes the architect M. Posokhin, "will be better organised than the towns in which we are living at present. It will provide the best conditions for the labour, life, and physical and intellectual development of man. But it would be wrong to imagine the town of the future as something entirely different, bearing no resemblance to our present towns....

"The towns of the future will take shape as a result of the development and modification both of existing, reconstructed towns which are constantly being re-developed and, as it were, 'growing younger', and also the building of new ones which will gradually acquire their communist content."²

¹ *Scientific Forecasts of the Development and Formation of Soviet Towns on the Basis of Social and Technological Progress*, Book 1, Moscow, 1968, pp. 3-4 (in Russian).

² M. Posokhin, "The Town of Tomorrow Is Being Created Today", *Pravda*, July 26, 1964.

The architect G. Gradov takes the view that industrial and residential complexes should be fused into a single system. Fully automated factories with an artificial micro-climate, which cause no noise or air pollution, will look from the outside like attractive public buildings and will be located in forest parks next to multi-storey (up to 100 floors and higher) residential blocks or beneath them. This arrangement will enable 85 to 90 per cent of town space to be saved for forest parks, swimming pools and stadiums and will provide the best possible solution to urban transport, since the majority of inhabitants will have to walk only 100-150 metres (2-7 minutes) from their flat to work, school and the shops, and only 1,000-2,000 metres (20-30 minutes) to the town's central public buildings.¹

Other plans provide for industrial zones located along main highways and separated by a forest park barrier from residential zones, creches, schools, and recreation parks. Some architects are proposing the planned development of existing residential areas upwards, by building (in several towns) ultra-high blocks of 200-300 storeys and higher, so as to utilise not only every square metre, but also every cubic metre of precious town space, and to leave more room for sun, greenery, fresh air and water.²

In such an approach the rational layout of residential areas, estates and particularly provision of amenities assume prime importance. New types of accommodation such as the house-complex are of special interest in this connection. Its main distinction is that public canteens, creches, community services, and places for adult recreation are right next to residential accommodation (either literally under the same roof or in separate blocks which may be linked by airy passageways).

"The socio-economic development of the last few years, the demographic advances and, finally, the possibilities which the scientific and technological progress of recent decades has opened up for construction," said the architect A. V. Ikon-

¹ G. Gradov, "The Influence of the Technical Transformation of Industrial Enterprises and the Collectivisation of Everyday Life on Urban Structure", *Arkhitectura SSSR*, No. 6, 1969 (in Russian).

² *The Social Prerequisites for the Formation of the Town of the Future*, Book 1, Moscow, 1967, p. 2.

nikov opening a scientific meeting specially devoted to future problems of town planning, "are leading to radical changes in the system of population settlement and in the whole organisation of an artificial material environment. Architecture and town planning are now faced with the entirely practical question of how to respond to dynamic changes in the requirements of our society, how to organise space so that in the course of the inevitable metamorphoses the need does not arise for demolishing material structures which have not yet recouped their initial cost technically".¹

With regard to the outlook for transport development, Soviet specialists tend towards the view that each of the existing forms of transport possesses great potential for further improvement and that, consequently, the transport of the future, the near future at least, will not involve the predominance of one type (say, air transport), but will continue to be a competition between rail, road, water, air and pipeline transport for the most economic, fast and convenient conveyance of passengers and freight.

There is general agreement that an important distinguishing feature of transport even in the relatively near future will be automation and cybernetisation. Railways, highways, sea and river craft, aeroplanes, pipelines, and the complex loading-unloading systems of transport junctions are gradually forming fully automated systems regulated by special electronic control centres. The operation of transport within these systems will be carried out, as a rule, without direct human participation, with the help of electronic devices such as automatic pilots and autodrivers, etc.²

A number of specialists are of the opinion that pipeline and air transport are potentially the most important means of transport. The former is capable in principle of conveying over large distances with a high degree of economy and a relatively high speed (in the order of several hundred kilometres per hour) not only oil-gas products, but also ore, building materials and even containers with any sort of freight. The

¹ Ibid. p. 3.

² *The Soviet Transport. The Results of the Last 50 Years and Future Prospects*, Moscow, 1967 (in Russian).

latter is indispensable for the rapid transportation of people and urgent freight. Academician A. N. Tupolev believed that by the end of the present century huge air liners would be able to transport a thousand passengers at a time or a hundred tons of freight at a speed of 7,000-10,000 km per hour, with the result that it will not take more than two hours to reach any part of the world.

All forms of communications will also be fully automated. This applies not only to radio and television, but also to telephone, telegraph and postal services. The next few decades will witness the establishment of an automated inter-city telephone (perhaps even video-telephone) network. Automated systems of subscriber telegraph will be extended. The handling of post at sorting offices will also be automated. The possibilities for radio and television, however, are particularly great. With the help of electronic computing devices the owner of a large stereoscopic and stereophonic colour T V set will be able not only to watch T V programmes, but also to reproduce on the screen the text of a book from a central library or a picture from a famous art gallery, and also take part in a business meeting or meet his friends in another town, all without leaving his armchair.

Corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences V. I. Siforov is of the opinion that in the future "the television and information storage services will be linked together into a single system. Moreover, television will be stereoscopic, as well as in colour. Each viewer will have the chance of selecting in a matter of seconds the particular programme he wants to watch at that given moment: a lecture, some interesting views, or a journey round the vast Soviet Union or some other country".¹

Naturally, this is bound to lead to radical changes in certain aspects of our way of life, since many of the journeys which we are compelled to make at the moment will no longer be necessary.

Future problems of the exploration of the Earth and outer space

Grandiose projects for the conquest of nature are systematically being implemented in the Soviet Union and other

¹ *Forecasting Scientific and Technological Progress*, Moscow, 1968, p. 29 (in Russian).

socialist countries. In the USSR cascades of huge hydroelectric stations have almost completely regulated the flow of such large rivers as the Volga, Dnieper and Don. The construction of a canal 1,000 miles long across the Kara Kum desert is nearing completion. It is planned to build similar cascades of dams on the Irtysh, Ob, Yenisei and Lena, to divert northern rivers to the Volga in order to maintain the existing level of the Caspian Sea. Part of the Ob and Irtysh is diverted in the direction of the Aral Sea with the help of powerful pumping stations in order to irrigate millions of hectares of arid Kazakh steppe, etc. The Communist Party and Soviet Government together with the whole community, are most concerned that human intervention in natural processes on such a large scale should be carried out on strictly scientific principles, which are both possible and necessary in a planned socialist economy.

A factor of no little importance in carrying out projects on a continental and, even more so, on an inter-continental scale is the insufficient study that has been made of the complex interconnection of cause and effect in natural processes, which threatens serious consequences in the case of active, but unscientific human intervention. There is no doubt that the intensity, scope and depth of the interaction between human society and the biogeosphere is growing literally every hour. This is recognised by scientists. People will be able to change the climatic conditions over vast areas in the comparatively near future, after the mastery of thermonuclear energy. This makes it essential to take into account both the short-term and long-term physical and social consequences.

Soviet engineering has pinpointed the spheres in which our present technological potential can be most effectively used. Planned reconstruction of the surface of our planet, which is incompatible with the arms race and with the policies of the imperialist powers in general, is becoming both practically possible and vitally important for the future development of mankind.

Soviet scientists and engineers have made a considerable contribution to the list of great projects for reconstructing the globe, including the following:

— projects for changing the climate of Siberia, Alaska and Canada by constructing a dam on the Bering Strait, which

would make it possible to regulate ocean currents in the area with the help of a system of powerful propeller pumps driven by atomic energy;

—a project for warming the coastline of the Sea of Okhotsk with the help of a dam in the Nevelskoi Strait between the mainland and Sakhalin Island (opening it at high tide would cause warm water from the Sea of Japan to flow into the Sea of Okhotsk);

—a project for irrigating and improving the climate of the northern Black Sea coast with the help of huge dikes along the sea shallows between the mouths of the Danube and the Crimean isthmus, and by building a canal across the isthmus and dam on the Kerch Strait; this means that the waters of the Danube, Dniester, Southern Bug, Dnieper and Don could be used for irrigating the surrounding areas, and warmer water from the Mediterranean would flow into the Black Sea.

There are other equally impressive projects,¹ including one for surrounding the earth with a ring of dust-like particles capable of reflecting an additional dose of solar radiation onto our planet, which would produce a climate in the polar regions similar to that in the equatorial latitudes and establish "white nights" all over the earth, considerably lighter than the June nights in Leningrad, for example.

The common aim of all these projects is to weigh up the possibilities of further human conquest of the earth's surface, bearing in mind that up to now only one-tenth of the dry land (not counting the polar regions) has been properly developed, namely, that which is used for agricultural purposes. To turn the deserts, semi-arid and arid zones, which occupy one-third of the land surface, into flowering orchards, to conquer the permafrost which deprives man of another quarter of the land surface, to drain millions of hectares of bogs, to organise highly productive forestry in place of the impenetrable undergrowth of the taiga and jungle, to place all the resources of the oceans at man's disposal, to learn to regulate in the interests of mankind the earth's volcanic regime, to control the weather and climate—these are the great tasks facing mankind, in the solution of which modern science can and must play an important role.

¹ I. I. Adabashev, *Man Improves the Planet*, Moscow, 1964.

Soviet scientists' forecasts in the field of space conquest are of great significance for the whole of world science. The world listens with special attention to the calculations and estimates of specialists who take a direct part in the practical checking of their own forecasts.

We have already mentioned that Soviet scientists categorically reject the widespread theory in the West about the inevitability of a clash with civilisations on other planets, the emergence of "space gangsterism" and suchlike projections of the "free world" to the expanses of outer space. On the other hand, the recent splendid advances in space research provide Soviet scientists with grounds for fairly bold forecasts.

The overwhelming majority of Soviet scientists proceed in their forecasts from the famous works of Konstantin Tsiolkovsky who predicted man's conquest of "near-solar space".

I. S. Shklovsky devoted the last two chapters of his book *The Universe. Life. Reason* to proving that in approximately 100-150 years' time "mankind's possibilities will greatly exceed the modest resources of earth" and that some time "between the 22nd and 23rd centuries mankind will enter a qualitatively new period in its development, linked with the settlement and reconstruction of space".¹ It is interesting that in many forecasts the positions of Shklovsky and A. C. Clarke (in his book *Profiles of the Future*) are fairly close to each other.

Most Soviet specialists believe that the next few decades will see the completion of basic preparations for planned mastery of the solar system, and there is every reason to expect that even before the year 2000 the Moon, Mars and possibly Venus will be covered with a network of research stations and industrial enterprises, to some extent similar to the Antarctic of the present day. At the same time, new automatic or manned stations will be put into the orbit of the artificial satellites of Mercury, Jupiter and other planets in the solar system.

"...A great deal will be transformed in our lives with the further conquest of outer space," writes Academician A. A. Blagonravov. "The world will become amazing and

¹ I. S. Shklovsky, op. cit., p. 256.

unusual. Various automatic stations, 'observation points' on Venus, Mars and the Moon, manned orbital satellites, etc., will appear in our solar system in the next few decades. They will inform people on Earth of what is taking place not only around our planet, but also in the most remote corners of the cosmic provinces."¹

Given these rates it is likely that by the late 20th and early 21st century the Moon, Mars and Venus will already have been examined to a considerable degree and their conquest will begin by the methods which are being planned at the present time. At the same time the study and eventual exploration of other objects in the solar system will be undertaken. Man is already embarking on space technology, productive forces and production in space. Konstantin Tsiolkovsky examined the possibility of setting up "industry in the ether", and it is no accident that today one of the most important lines of basic and applied research is advancing towards setting up industry in outer space. For example, Soviet scientists have produced technical projects for solar and atomic electric power stations in outer space, oxygen producing devices on the Moon, etc. The establishment of industry and technology beyond the limits of our planet will undoubtedly have a strong reverse effect in the near future and will stimulate scientific and technological progress as a whole.

Most Soviet scientists also think that inter-stellar flights at relativistic speeds are possible. True, some of them, such as Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences V. I. Siforov and Candidate of physico-mathematical sciences B. K. Fedyushin, believe that the present state of technology makes it impossible to imagine what a star ship will be like, because all the types which have been proposed so far do not stand up to scientific criticism: the problems of obtaining and storing sufficiently effective fuel remain unsolved, and the minimum starting mass of a star ship is estimated in tens of millions of tons.² However, as Shklovsky points out, "the difficulties enumerated do not give grounds for concluding that inter-stellar flights at almost the speed of light are impossible even in the next few centuries. Only

¹ Quoted from V. Gubarev, *Man. Earth. The Universe*, Moscow, 1965, p. 125 (in Russian).

² *The Future of Science*, pp. 108-18.

100 years ago the prospects of man flying in a device heavier than air seemed most unlikely. Our experience of scientific and technological development teaches us that if there is a public need for an invention which does not conflict with the principles of science it is sure to be made sooner or later. And the rate of scientific and technological development is increasing with each decade."¹

The search for intelligent life in the universe is recognised as an important pre-condition for the future conquest of outer space. This problem, which for a long time was simply an object of abstract discussion and a theme for science-fiction novels, has in recent years, to quote V. I. Siforov, "turned up on the agenda of front-line science". In his opinion, two factors have played a decisive role in this: the success of the first space flights has stirred many scientists and engineers to give serious consideration to the possibility of designing a spaceship capable of spanning the inconceivably vast distances which separate us from the stars, while the rapid development of radio astronomy and the appearance of cybernetic methods of processing its data are opening up the possibility of establishing a direct link with extra-terrestrial civilisations.²

It is perhaps most indicative of the views of Soviet specialists in this field that alongside an article by B. K. Fedyushin arguing the unlikelihood of photon star ships being constructed even in the distant future (although he does not reject the possibility of inter-stellar flights based on other principles), one finds in the book *The Future of Science* an article by I. B. Gutchin, Cand. Sc. (Technology), which examines in detail the possibility of contacting extra-terrestrial civilisations by means of space communications. The latter problem is attracting a great deal of attention among Soviet specialists today. A special scientific conference was devoted to it, attended by Academicians V. A. Ambartsunyan, Y. B. Zeldovich and V. A. Kotelnikov, and corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences A. A. Pistolkors, I. S. Shklovsky and other eminent Soviet scientists.

In conclusion it should be noted that Academician

¹ I. S. Shklovsky, op. cit., p. 245.

² *The Future of Science*, Book 1, Moscow, 1966, pp. 108, 280.

A. N. Kolmogorov, I. S. Shklovsky and other Soviet scientists as well as A. C. Clarke, consider it possible that intelligent life itself, on the scale of the whole universe, may undergo qualitative changes in the process of its development. For example, the emergence of a man-made civilisation of highly organised intelligent beings, who will turn out to be better adapted than people for the further conquest of outer space.¹ This does not exclude friendly contact between people on Earth and the representatives of such a civilisation and all other highly organised civilisations, as brothers in intelligence. In this sense the hypothesis of Professor I. A. Yefremov on the existence in the Ring Nebula of regular communication between highly organised civilisations (known to readers from his science-fiction novel *Andromeda Nebula*) is a symbol, as it were, of Soviet geo-space forecasting, so different from the Western line of forecasting.

Science and social progress

In the preceding sections we have dealt with a number of characteristic features distinguishing Soviet scientific forecasting from bourgeois forecasting. Yet perhaps the most important difference in this respect is that we do not contrast technological and socio-economic forecasting, but link technical and social progress closely, in the conviction that science and technology are not aims in themselves, but the foundation for creating the material basis of communism as the social system towards which mankind is progressing.

"The aim, the ideal of social progress," Academician N. N. Semyonov writes in this connection, "may be formulated as follows: the maximal happiness for the maximal number of people. The first prerequisite for this is, naturally, the full satisfaction of each person's material and cultural needs. Over the last twenty to thirty years the pace of scientific and technological development has acquired quite exceptional, hitherto unprecedented proportions, and it is difficult to imagine with what tremendous speed man's prospects for mastering the forces of nature will develop in the future. This is creating a totally real scientific and technological basis for producing any degree of prosperity

¹ I. S. Shklovsky, op. cit., p. 280.

for all people in the world. Essentially this process will be limited not by scientific and technological possibilities, nor labour and financial resources, but by the social structure, in particular, the contradictions of the capitalist system, the danger of wars, and colonialism."¹

The conviction that technological and social progress are closely linked runs through all the works of Soviet specialists dealing with the problems of the future of the Earth and mankind. Social progress is seen not as the automatic consequence of technological progress, but as a result of the constant interaction of technological and social progress, which is reflected in the world historical process in general and the revolutionary movement in particular. This means, incidentally, that the social sciences, as well as the natural sciences, play a great role in the historical process which determines the most important features of future human society. "We often say," notes Academician M. V. Keldysh, "that the natural sciences form the basis of scientific and technological progress, the foundation for creating the material basis of communism, whereas the social sciences form the basis for guiding the development of society. In fact, however, the position is considerably more complicated, because the natural sciences influence both the ideology and the management of society, and the results of the social sciences affect material production."² In the capitalist world an increasing rift can be observed between the development of the natural and social sciences.

The drawing closer of the social and natural sciences in the USSR is the inevitable result of the law discovered by Engels by which the degree to which man becomes the real and conscious lord over nature depends directly on the degree to which he controls his property relations.³

The creation of economic conditions to ensure the fastest possible practical application of scientific achievements is of great importance in this connection. "The most important task of specialists engaged in socialist economics is to elabo-

¹ N. N. Semyonov, "Science and Social Progress", *Izvestia*, July 1, 13, 1961 (the section quoted was written jointly with Y. N. Semyonov),

² M. Keldysh, "The Natural Sciences and Their Significance for a World Outlook and Technological Progress", *Kommunist*, No. 17, 1966, p. 29.

³ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 338.

rate such proposals for improving our economic system that events themselves will force us to solve questions of technological progress in good time and effectively."¹

Soviet scientists, basing themselves on Marxist-Leninist teaching on nature and society, are convinced that scientific forecasting of the future can be done, and that scientific views of the future (unlike religious and utopian ones) objectively reflect reality, in this case, future reality.

"...Discussion of scientific forecasts," said the head of the Soviet Government, A. N. Kosygin, at a meeting of the State Planning Committee on March 19, 1965, "should precede the drawing up of plans for the various branches of the economy ... in order to clear the way for the advanced and progressive in good time, to know in which direction the plan should be elaborated."² The Central Committee of the CPSU drew special attention to the need to draw up long-term plans for the development of the Soviet economy, taking into account advances expected in science and technology. Economic plans should consider the prospects for scientific and technological progress, provide for the latest scientific and technological advances to be applied as quickly as possible, and be based on real and objective estimates.

The Communist Party and Soviet Government devote considerable attention to the study of problems of social forecasting. The joint decision passed by the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR on measures to increase the efficiency of scientific organizations and accelerate the application of scientific and technological achievements in the national economy (September 1968) placed special emphasis on the need "for making scientific forecasts covering a prolonged period (10-15 and more years) and the most important problems of economic development."³ This presupposes, not last nor least, working out theoretical questions of forecasting and activating Soviet research in this field.

In recent years hundreds of special research groups, sectors and departments have been set up in the Soviet Union dealing with problems of scientific and technological, eco-

¹ M. Keldysh, op. cit., p. 46.

² *Planovoye Khozyaistvo* (Planned Economy), No 4, 1965, pp. 4-5.

³ *Pravda*, October 23, 1968.

nomic, sociological and other branches of social forecasting, development of theories and forecasting methods, prospective scientific and technological problems, town planning, etc. This type of research is being carried on in Moscow, Kiev, Leningrad, Novosibirsk and other scientific centres. A great deal of attention is being paid to these problems by the state committees on science and technology, planning and construction, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and a number of other state committees, ministries and scientific establishments which include special commissions for coordinating various forecasts.

Several basic trends have emerged in social forecasting.

These include, in particular, scientific and technological forecasting which covers the forecasting of the development of science as a social phenomenon (scientific trends, the further development of the structure of science, training of scientists, organisation of scientific research, etc.), and the forecasting of the development of technology as a social phenomenon (the development of energy resources and raw materials, industry, agriculture, building, transport, communications). It also includes the social aspects of information storage and retrieval and problems connected with measurement. Other basic trends are sociological forecasting, the development of the social structure of society, social organisation and management, family relations, use of leisure, etc. This is closely linked with forecasting in the field of demographic and ethnic processes, social aspects of public education, culture and the arts, health protection,¹ town planning, etc. They also include comprehensive forecasting of such social results of the scientific and technical revolution as the redistribution of manpower, the intellectualisation of society, and changes in the interrelation and content of working and leisure time and in the organisation of labour and everyday life.

Yet another main line of research is economic forecasting, the most advanced type of forecasting at the present time, which forms a special group of economic forecasts, including forecasts of scientific, technological, demographic and sociological nature, as well as purely economic ones.

¹ Sometimes health problems form a special section of medical and biological forecasting.

Economic forecasts aim directly at increasing the scientific level and efficiency of national economic development plans. A forecast can and should not only precede the plan, but should also constantly run parallel to planning, so that the planner can react in good time to this or that divergence in the plan's implementation. The main thing is that the forecast can and should weigh up the possible consequences of the plan's implementation, thereby providing the long-term view for planning.

Emphasising the importance of forecasting, Academician N. P. Fedorenko noted that "periods of 5-10 years are now frequently insufficient for planning individual branches of industry and agriculture.... To obtain the best results it is essential to predict the development of industry up to 1985-1990 at least. This also makes it necessary to draw up planned forecasts for the next ten, fifteen and twenty years and more."¹

A special place in this sphere of research is occupied by comprehensive problems concerning the exploration of the Earth and outer space, for example, utilisation of arid and polar regions, the ocean, control of climate and weather, flora and fauna, the study of the Moon, Mars, Venus and the solar system as a whole, and the development of space radio communications and inter-stellar travel.

It is essential to develop methods which make it possible to increase the accuracy and time span of forecasts considerably, and to take into account inevitable future qualitative advances in the observable tendencies of phenomena, and to synthesise the forecasts of separate sciences. In this connection the development of general philosophical and methodological problems of prognostication as the science of the laws and methods of forecasting becomes particularly pressing.

These problems include, for example, a philosophical analysis of such categories of concrete scientific predictions as forecasting, planning, programming, and designing and management of social processes as a whole; analysis of the relation of hypothesis and forecast, of probable and authentic knowledge about the future; an epistemological analysis

¹ *Forecasting Progress in Science and Technology*, pp. 14-15 (in Russian).

of the properties of human thought in relation to the advance reflection of reality; elaboration of the logic and psychology of forecasting; development of the theory of complex systems and factor analysis, the theory of games, the theory of sets, the theory of operations, the theory of decision-taking, etc. Study of this type of problems makes it possible to advance the development of concrete methods of forecasting. Experience shows that concrete social studies based on Marxist-Leninist theory are of great assistance in this respect: special methods of processing statistical and documentary data, methods of taking polls among various sections of the population, particularly among specialists, methods of organising the discussion of various prospective problems, methods of sociological experiments and social simulation. Alongside the use of modern advances in mathematics and cybernetics, the use of modern computer technology, all this is capable of greatly increasing the efficiency of concrete forecasts.

As we know, a forecast is an immanent function of any science dealing—each in its own field—with the problems of past, present and future. Basing itself on the forecasts of individual sciences and correlating them, social prognostication aims at working out a single strategy, a single system of forecasting, the integration and synthesis of concrete forecasts on a higher level, the creation of qualitatively new, more effective methods of forecasting.

Problems of social forecasting, the planning and management of social processes, were at the centre of attention of the VII International Sociological Congress. Hundreds of reports were presented on the society of the future as the object of long-term planning. At the meetings of the Congress sections specialists from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries challenged the multitude of different and conflicting bourgeois conceptions of the future society with the Marxist-Leninist conception, which proceeds from the theoretical tenets of scientific communism and rests upon the firm methodological basis of dialectical and historical materialism.

The Congress provided further proof of the pressing need for working out concrete prospects for the development of human society and the scientific study of the future of the Earth and mankind on the basis of Marxism-Leninism,

which is incompatible with any sort of social utopia, particularly the utopian idea that the obsolete capitalist mode of production can be preserved in the future. Leonid Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said in his report to the 24th Party Congress: "The prospects are that the revolution in the development of the productive forces, touched off by science and its discoveries, will become increasingly significant and profound. The task we face is one of historical importance: *organically to fuse the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system*, to unfold more broadly our own, intrinsically socialist, forms of fusing science with production."¹

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 69.

Part V

COMMUNISM —

THE FUTURE OF ALL MANKIND

The twentieth century has become a turning-point in world history. It has ushered in the radical change of mankind from pre-history to the true history of its ascending, progressive development. In all spheres of social life—economic, political and ideological—there is now the struggle of two socio-economic formations: the recently emerged communist formation, which represents the peak of world civilisation, and the declining but still powerful capitalist formation, which concludes the pre-history of mankind.

The birth of communism has not only its own real history, but also the logic of struggle and victory. This history and logic are indissolubly connected with the struggle of the Russian proletariat, the whole Soviet people, the CPSU and the architect of the new world—Lenin.

In his report "Lenin's Cause Lives On and Triumphs", Leonid Brezhnev said: "Today when the entire course of social development inexorably hastens the downfall of capitalism, Lenin's words that Marxism raises questions 'not only in the sense of explaining the past but also in the sense of a bold forecast of the future and of bold practical action for its achievement' resound with particular force. While being occupied with the present and working on contemporary day-to-day problems, we compare our actions with our ideals, with immediate and distant prospects of social development. We think of and build the future."¹

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Lenin's Cause Lives On and Triumphs*, Moscow, p.79.

THE INAUGURATOR OF THE COMMUNIST FUTURE OF ALL MANKIND

By virtue of the dialectic of historical development Russia has become the homeland of Leninism, a new stage in the development of Marxism. In creatively developing the teaching of Marx and Engels, Lenin was the first to reveal the essence of this new age and show the historic role of Russia and the Russian working class in the creation of the communist future. Already in his early work *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* Lenin wrote with brilliant insight about the historic mission of the Russian working class in opening the communist era. "...The Russian WORKER, rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT (side by side with the proletariat of ALL COUNTRIES) along the straight road of open political struggle to THE VICTORIOUS COMMUNIST REVOLUTION."¹

Lenin was deeply convinced that the party of the Russian proletariat created by him, the party of a new type, would become a mighty factor in the revolutionary transformation of not only Russia, but the whole of human society. The victory of the October Socialist Revolution was splendid confirmation of his brilliant forecast.

Unlike bourgeois ideology, Marxism-Leninism has always attached fundamental importance to a profound study of the past and future development of mankind. Right at the beginning of his revolutionary activity Lenin wrote that Marxists carry out "long and arduous work on what promises a future".² He said that Marxists should study human society "from the standpoint, not only of the past, but also of the future".³

Lenin's firm faith in the future of socialism was based on his knowledge of the objective and subjective factors of social development. "Our natural wealth, our manpower and the splendid impetus which the great revolution has given to the creative powers of the people are ample material to build a truly mighty and abundant Russia," he wrote.⁴

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 300.

² Ibid., Vol. 6, p. 195.

³ Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 75.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 161.

This optimistic forecast, uttered on many occasions by Lenin, was based on a profound knowledge of the laws of social development and on the creative discovery of new laws in the emergence of the communist formation. A characteristic feature of the Leninist analysis of these laws is recognition of the inner organic connection between the decisive role of objective conditions and the constantly increasing importance of the subjective factor based upon them.

The ripening of the material prerequisites for socialism, the sharpening of the radical contradictions of capitalism, and the emergence of a revolutionary situation—these are the most important features of the determining role of objective conditions in the socialist transformation of society. Lenin stressed that the aggravation of the contradictions of capitalism is the most powerful motive force. Developing socialist ideology, bringing it into the working-class movement and creating a Marxist-Leninist party of the proletariat capable of guiding the struggle of the masses and leading them to a decisive battle against capitalism—these are the main characteristics of the decisive role of the subjective factor.

Denial or ignoring of the decisive role of objective conditions leads logically to political adventurism and anarchism, which is a characteristic feature of petty-bourgeois revolutionarism and all forms of “Left”-wing opportunism.

Denial or ignoring of the decisive role of the subjective factor, on which the turning of objective possibilities into reality depends, leads logically to a philosophy of political passivity and laissez-faire, which is characteristic of all forms of Right-wing opportunism. Lenin profoundly elaborated the dialectic of the unity and distinction of the objective and subjective in the revolutionary process, their interaction, mutual influence and intermingling in the course of the socialist transformation of society. Anti-communist ideologists, realising that this is the strongest aspect of Leninist methodology, which makes it possible to give a profound analysis of the most complex and contradictory processes in the birth of the new world, campaign against Leninism by drawing an artificial distinction between it and Marxism.

Lenin taught us that the highest criterion of the truth of Marxist teaching is the extent to which it corresponds to

developing objective reality. Since the victory of the October Revolution, the emergence and development of the new society has been proceeding on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the law-governed establishment of the communist formation. Lenin defined the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution as a radical turning-point in the development of world history, a world breakthrough and a new step forward in the ascending advance of society. He frequently stressed that the October Revolution "has charted the road to socialism for the whole world and has shown the bourgeoisie that their triumph is coming to an end."¹ Developing this idea further, Lenin emphasised that "fighting for a socialist system in Russia, we are fighting for socialism all over the world."²

Lenin's appraisal of the epoch-making importance of the October Revolution and the building of the new world today lie at the basis of the unshakeable ideological faith of all progressive people throughout the world in the eventual total victory of communism.

The historic successes of communist construction in the USSR have turned the homeland of Leninism into the mainstay of the world revolutionary movement. The international importance of socialist and communist construction in the USSR, its international authority and socio-political and ideological superiority, its growing military and economic power, have made the country the inaugurator of the communist era and simultaneously the world centre of attraction for all truly revolutionary and liberating forces, the kernel of the unity of the world socialist system and of the whole communist movement. This is why progressive people associate success in the struggle for peace and national liberation with the historic role of the Soviet Union. As Lenin put it, "there is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is—working whole-heartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle*, this, *and only this*, line, in *every* country without exception".³

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 44.

² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, p. 75.

This Leninist idea about the essence of proletarian internationalism ran through all the work of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1969. The Meeting's Main Document reads as follows: "*Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and to proletarian internationalism, and dedicated and devoted service in the interests of their peoples and the common cause of socialism are a requisite for the efficacy and correct orientation of united action by the Communist and Workers' Parties, a guarantee that they will achieve their historic goals.*"¹

THE ESSENCE OF COMMUNISM AND ITS MAIN PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT

It is now some time since the progressive people of our time first realised the truth of the scientific proposition that world communism is the splendid future of the whole of mankind. This principal scientifically-based and optimistic conclusion about the future of all mankind was first reached by Marx and Engels a century or so ago. Having created a truly scientific theory of social development, the founders of scientific communism predicted that world communism would be the result of the spread and full victory of the socialist revolution. This uniquely scientific theory of the communist transformation of the world in new historical conditions was further developed and elevated to a new, higher stage by Lenin who has gone down in history as the great architect of communist society. Marxist-Leninist theory, constantly developed by the CPSU and other Communist and Workers' parties, their leaders and theoreticians, has become a powerful, invincible weapon in the struggle for communism. No theories or forecasts of bourgeois ideologists about the future of mankind can withstand this spiritual weapon.

The Programme of the CPSU contains the following definition of communist society based on Marxist-Leninist theory and generalisation of the experience in building the new society: "*Communism is a classless social system with one form*"

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 38.*

*of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all the springs of co-operative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs' will be implemented. Communism is a highly organised society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labour for the good of society will become the prime vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognised by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people."*¹

The transition period from the old system to the new one is an essential, universally inevitable stage in the birth of the new society. The emergence and development of the world socialist system has shown that no country, regardless of its stage of economic, political and cultural development, can bypass the transition period, for this is the period of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialist society through the dictatorship of the proletariat. Depending on the concrete historical conditions the operation of this general law is characterised by many features which manifest themselves in the various forms of the dictatorship of the working class, in the presence of a single-party or multi-party system with the indispensable guiding role of the Communist Party, in the periods and rates of industrialisation of the country or the all-round development of industry as the leading branch of the economy, in forms of agricultural cooperation, the carrying out of a cultural revolution, etc. The difficulties of building a new society with all the related consequences and contradictions arise in all socialist countries in various degrees and forms.

The victory of socialism, its steady consolidation and all-round development, which reveal more and more fully the historic advantages of the new system, are an inevitable stage in the development of the communist formation. The international experience of all the socialist countries confirms the Marxist-Leninist tenet that no nation can bypass not only the transition stage, but also the first, socialist

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 509.

phase in the development of the communist formation. In general, in order to understand the many distinctive aspects and historic advantages of the communist formation and the two main phases of its development, it is essential to compare it with the preceding, capitalist formation. As is known, the formation and development of the capitalist formation, including its two principal stages—the pre-monopoly and monopoly stages—took more than 300 years. The pre-monopoly stage in the leading capitalist countries covered more than 200 years.

The formation and development of the communist formation is taking place at immeasurably faster rates, in spite of totally new difficulties involved in the birth and formation of the new system.

Today, on the basis of the experience of the USSR and the whole world socialist system, one can draw the theoretical conclusion that the socialist phase is not only an inevitable stage in the development of the communist formation, but that it will take a relatively longer time than the transition period.

In the Soviet Union the transition period took approximately twenty years. The socialist phase, however, in the course of which there is all-round development of the new society and preparation of all the economic, political, social and ideological prerequisites for communism, which steadily accelerate the gradual transition to the higher phase of the communist formation, takes considerably more time. This law applies to the other socialist countries as well, regardless of their special features. And this is no mere accident.

The transition period, the period of the revolutionary transformation of capitalism into socialism, ensures the creation of a new type of society. But subsequent development is connected with the consolidation and all-round development of a fundamentally new type of social relations, with the fuller unfolding of historically unprecedented aspects and properties of the socialist system. One must also bear in mind not only the inner laws of the socialist phase, but also the principal contradiction of our age—the competition and struggle of two opposing social formations—the old, capitalist one and the new, communist one.

Capitalism, for all its internally irremediable defects which hamper the potentialities for social progress, is still capable of relative and uneven growth of production by using scientific and technological advances. The new formation, already in the socialist phase, is demonstrating its indisputable superiority to capitalism. This superiority will be revealed to an even greater extent as maximum use is made of all the possibilities of the scientific and technological revolution. This is one of the main tasks facing the economy of the USSR and the development of other socialist countries.

When socialism fully reveals and realises all its advantages in the process of the gradual transition to communism, the higher stage of communism will arrive.

The indissoluble link between the emergence of communism and the all-round development of socialism is obvious. Lenin, foreseeing this dialectical connection between the two phases in the development of the communist formation, said: "...In striving for socialism ... we are convinced that it will develop into communism...."¹ He warned about the difficulties of building not only socialism but also the higher phase of communism which is to complete the radical renewal of all aspects of social life on a fundamentally new basis, where the free and all-round development of each individual will be a condition of the full flowering of the whole society. Speaking about the higher stage of communism, Lenin stressed: "The future society we are striving for, the society in which all must work, the society in which there will be no class distinctions, will take a long time to build."² Unlike socialism, which arises in the process of destroying capitalism, the building of communism takes place on the basis of socialism and within the framework of the socialist phase. This fact relatively accelerates the process of the building of communism and determines the new law of its emergence.

Marx called this law the emergence of communism on its own basis. The transition to the higher phase of communism will be complete only after the implementation of the following three main tasks set out in the CPSU Programme—the creation of the material and technical basis for commu-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 456.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 324.

nism, the improvement of social relations and the moulding of the new man. This will crown the world process of society's transition from pre-history to the true history of the progressive development of mankind. Unlike the historically transient, although prolonged, socialist phase, the communist phase, in the words of Marx and Engels, will be the highest form of human organisation.

This general outlook for the advance towards communism, which takes into account the real possibilities created under developed socialism, was the subject of profound, scientific analysis and theoretical elucidation at the 24th CPSU Congress. Quite understandably and logically, attention was concentrated on ways of accelerating the creation of the material and technical base of communism, on vital problems of the socio-economic and socio-political development of society, and on the tasks involved in the formation of the new man.

The creation of the material and technical base of communism is the crucial task in communist construction. As Lenin said: "We value communism only when it is based economically."¹ And this was the basis which the 24th Congress provided for the further development of Soviet society. The CPSU Central Committee Report, the Directives for the Ninth Five-Year Plan, and the Congress resolutions contain a thorough and profound analysis of the Communist Party's economic policy at the present stage, which is based on a comprehensive theoretical study of the present situation and its tasks.

The essence and supreme aim of this policy is "to secure a considerable rise in the living standard and cultural level of the people on the basis of high rates of growth of socialist production, increase in its effectiveness, scientific and technical progress and accelerated growth of the productivity of labour".² The actual elaboration of this task as the main one in the Ninth Five-Year Plan is the result of the creative application of Marxist-Leninist methodology to the analysis of the present stage of the Soviet state.

The advancing of this main task, which provides for a certain increase in the growth rate of production of means of

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 191.

² *24th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 50.

consumption by comparison with the growth rate of production of means of production, is based on the tremendous success of Soviet society, on the economic and military power of socialism. The correctness of this policy is based on consideration of the objective economic laws of socialism and the Party's general political strategy in communist construction.

In conformity with the objective economic laws the CPSU is continuing the general policy of accelerated development of the production of means of production, heavy industry, particularly those of its branches which promote the creation of the material and technical base of communism. Explaining the essence of the Communist Party's main strategical line after the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin said that it was essential to do as much as possible in one country to accelerate the victory of the revolution in other countries and influence the course of world revolution mainly by one's example, by successes in the field of economic construction.

The most that can be done in one country is the building of socialism and communism. The victory of socialism in the Soviet Union has demonstrated the superiority of the new world in many respects, above all in the planned development of the national economy and in the rapid, steady growth rates of socialist production for the benefit of the constant growing standard of living of all working people.

The time has now come when the Communist Party, following its Leninist strategical line, has set the task of effecting a considerable rise in the material and cultural standards of the whole people. The fulfilment of this task will reveal even more fully and comprehensively to all peoples the vast superiority of communism over capitalism. Raising the material well-being of the working people is dictated by the inner laws of socialist society, by the needs of the development of its economy, and is one of the most important prerequisites for the further growth of production which, at the present stage, is making increasing demands not only on machines and technology, but principally on the workers themselves. Thus, on the one hand, the main task of the Nine-Year Plan reflects the consistency of the Communist Party's policy to increase material and moral labour incentives. On the other hand, "the question is posed much more broadly: to create conditions favourable for the all-round development of the abilities and creative activity of Soviet

people, of all working people, that is, to develop the main productive force of society."¹

The solution of this main task demands corresponding changes in economic proportions. But this does not mean that less attention is to be paid to heavy industry. On the contrary, its high development rates retain their importance in the present situation, because heavy industry is the basis of expanding socialist reproduction, creating the material and technical basis of communism and maintaining the country's defence capacity at the required level.

The communist movement is advancing towards its ultimate goal, consistently passing through the objectively inevitable phases of the communist formation which are universally compulsory for all countries—the phases of socialism and communism. In the process of socialist transformation scientific communism is confronted with a new problem—that of the main stages in the building of the new society. Basing itself on Lenin's scientific predictions and generalising the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the 24th CPSU Congress made a profound analysis of developed socialist society, a stage which is inevitable for all countries.

The main criterion of the maturity of socialist society is the achievement of harmonic unity of three basic spheres of social life—economic, political and ideological. Being the first country to have built a developed socialist society, the Soviet Union is now advancing towards the creation of the foundations of communist society, principally its material and technical basis. The other socialist countries, drawing themselves on the experience of the Soviet Union and taking into account their own specific peculiarities, are striving to build a developed socialist society and preparing the essential prerequisites for a subsequent gradual transition to communism. This is postulated in the congress documents of the Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist countries.

Thus, the international experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has confirmed and enriched the fundamental tenet of scientific communism that the communist formation goes through two phases in its development, that with the building of a developed socialist society, its

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 51.

steady consolidation and development, socialism gradually ~~develops into communism~~. Guided by this conclusion, the 24th Congress of the CPSU again pointed out that the transition to communism requires lengthy and serious preparation, definite material and spiritual prerequisites.

Modern bourgeois ideologists insist that communism is an impossible utopia. Unlike the bourgeois ideologists of the last century, the exponents of modern anti-communism admit at best the possibility of achieving socialism, for it is impossible to deny the actual existence of the world socialist system and, particularly the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union. Many of them declare that the building of communism is impossible, particularly such features of it as the all-round development of the individual who is ready to work according to his ability and receive according to his needs.

The bourgeois critics of communism considered and still do consider this principle to be unrealistic and utopian. They advance the following arguments against it. First, they think it impossible to bring about distribution according to needs, because they believe that society will never attain a level of labour productivity which could ensure full abundance of material and spiritual values. The most that society can provide is a more or less even distribution of incomes. Secondly, they believe that if people receive according to their needs, they will not work because of "incurable" human weakness.

A few years ago at a special meeting of the Roman Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas devoted to the struggle against communism, the Vatican "experts" attempted to produce theoretical proof that communism is utopian and that capitalist society is eternal, God-given. At this meeting great stress was laid on the idea that reason also condemns communism because the latter by its methods (i.e., by revolutionising the economic system) is attempting to create a new man, an ideal human society, free from struggle and oppression, in which each person will be able to satisfy his wishes and be ready to work for the good of others with all his strength. Human nature is such, however, they maintain, that an abundance of good things will not satisfy man's wishes or moderate his passions. Envy, jealousy, vanity and thirst for power—these are the human weaknesses which, in the opinion of

these theoreticians, cannot be changed by any economic utopia.

Communism as the future of all mankind is declared a utopia not only by bourgeois ideologists, but also by many reformists among the modern social democratic theoreticians. Karl Popper in his work *The Poverty of Historicism* calls Marx a utopian thinker because he envisaged the building of a society in which each individual would work freely according to his ability and all his needs would be satisfied.

Summarising these ideas widespread among the ideologists of anti-communism, the American professors Karel and Irene Hulička do their best to prove the impossibility of building communism. They maintain that most non-Communists hold the opinion—not without grounds, according to them—that distribution “according to needs” will always be impracticable. Summing up their “arguments”, they conclude that the new Soviet man will not appear after all. Neither man nor the organisation of society will approach the ideal, and social distinctions, transgressions, greed, envy and conceit will not be eradicated.

The experience of socialist and communist construction confirms the most important tenet of Marxist-Leninist ideology that the revolutionary transformation of society is also the prime condition for overcoming those negative features in man's character (or, as the Papal experts like to put it, “in human nature”) which have become inculcated over the centuries by the economic system and the ideology of antagonistic formations.

The opponents of communism pretend to criticise on the basis of a common-sense interpretation of the new processes and prospects of social development. In fact, however, they turn out to have tiny minds, incapable of understanding the great social transformations which took place in the first half of the twentieth century and even more incapable of envisaging the communist future of mankind. Karel and Irena Hulička and their like have not learnt any lessons from the fact that bourgeois forecasts about the impracticability of socialism and its main features have been disproved, particularly those about the abolition of private property and the establishment of public property, the elimination of the exploitation of man by man and the creation of relations based on mutual aid and cooperation in the

production process, the abolition of national oppression and the attainment of equal rights and friendship between peoples. All these and other features of socialism, the prerequisites for which were prepared in our time, have been realised thanks to the victory of the socialist revolution.

A profound knowledge of the laws of social development enabled Lenin in the very first years of the birth of the new society not only to speak with conviction about the victory of socialism, but also to reveal the young shoots of communism and forecast their inevitable victory. This applies, above all, to the communist attitude to work, the main feature of the new, fully developed man.

The new, fully developed man is formed during the creation of the material and technical basis of communism, particularly of its main attributes, such as automation.

During the gradual transition to communism the creative nature of work increases. It gradually turns into man's prime vital need. His inner freedom is revealed more and more, and his activity in all spheres of production and social life develops continuously.

These shoots of communism in labour grow constantly as socialist competition gets under way. The following statements are typical of the majority of Soviet people: "I cannot live without work. We find life's inspiration and meaning in the work done in the name of communism"; "For me, as for millions of Soviet people, work has become a great joy and happiness"; "Each day I go to my factory with joy in my heart, because for me, as for many Soviet workers, work is a need, happiness"; "The factory is not only the production but also the social nucleus of society"; "I like work. It is the most important thing for me because it is necessary for society. This is the requirement without which we cannot live." These and other similar statements show the process of development, as Lenin predicted, from the young shoots of communism to full communism.

The formation of the new man combined with other tasks of building communism will lead to the realisation of its main principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

It would be wrong to reduce this principle simply to consumption. In fact it expresses the most important and indissoluble aspects of the life and activity of communist

society—the higher stage in the development of production, consumption and the progress of the individual.

The principle of communism demands from each member of society that he works according to his ability. The all-round development of the latter makes it possible to create an abundance of consumer goods without which there can be no distribution according to needs.

The realisation of the communist principle will be heralded by the achievement of full equality between people. Under socialism equality is achieved in relation to the basic means of production, but there still remains a certain inequality in the material reward which each person receives according to his labour and not according to his needs. Since people have varying abilities and marital status (married, single, large families, small families, etc.) it is natural that distribution according to labour does not and cannot provide full material equality, the same level of economic well-being. Marx pointed out that individual talent and unequal capacity for work are natural privileges.

With distribution according to labour these natural privileges are the cause of a certain material inequality between members of society enjoying equal rights. Only the transition from the principle of distribution according to labour to the principle of distribution according to needs will ensure full social equality independent of these natural privileges.

This truth is beyond the understanding of bourgeois ideologists, who consider the building of a classless society unrealistic because, they argue, there will always be a difference in people's abilities. This traditional argument was repeated at the VII Sociological Congress by the American ideologist of the "post-industrial society" Daniel Bell. He said that the ideal post-industrial society would never be classless because individuals had different abilities and possibilities. Such statements reveal an incurable defect in bourgeois sociology—confusion of the biological with the social.

By true equality Marxism-Leninism does not mean biological equality, as the enemies of communism would have people believe, but social equality. There never has been and never will be biological equality. Communism stands for

a variety of human features and talent, unseen before in history, with the full social equality of each person. This means that, in spite of different physical and mental abilities, marital status, age, etc., everyone will have the opportunity to satisfy all his material and spiritual needs. This is the meaning of the great basic principle of communism.

The creation of the material and technical basis of communism, the all-round cultural development of all members of society, the perfection of all aspects of production relations, the attainment of higher labour productivity and full abundance, this is the necessary economic basis for the transition to the communist principle of distribution according to needs. Lenin constantly stressed that raising labour productivity is one of the prime tasks without which the ultimate transition to communism is impossible.

Communist education of the masses, turning labour into a prime vital requirement, a conscious attitude, growing into a habit, towards the fulfilment of all one's obligations to society, this is the necessary spiritual basis for the transition to communist distribution according to needs. Lenin wrote that we give the name of communism to the type of system in which people grow accustomed to their social obligations without special organs of coercion.

The high sense of communist awareness of members of society will show itself in the fact that under communism people will not demand the impossible or take more than they need. This is what Engels had in mind when he wrote that under communism each person will be sure of the satisfaction of his reasonable needs on a constantly growing scale. Under communism it will be a question not of an unlimited, artificial increase in consumption of products of prime necessity, but of extending the range of new needs and their reasonable satisfaction regulated by the high sense of communist awareness of the members of society.

Only taken together, as a whole, can the economic, social and spiritual bases of communism provide the opportunity to change to the principle of distribution according to needs. This is understandable. It is impossible to switch to distribution according to needs if there is no full abundance. Nor can one do so, if people have not yet become accustomed to the communist attitude towards work as a prime

vital requirement. There may be full abundance, but it cannot be distributed according to needs if people regard work as a burden and do not carry out their obligations to society voluntarily.

Consequently, only the combination of the material, social and spiritual bases of communism makes it possible for society to go over to distribution according to needs.

Before this principle can be put into practice it will be necessary to raise the planning of the national economy to a higher level. The prime task of the planning organs will be to take full account of growing social and personal needs.

Distribution according to needs, which is possible on the basis of popular communist ownership of the means of production, will not exclude personal ownership of consumer goods. Moreover, communism will provide all members of the classless society for the first time with the opportunity of having at their personal disposal everything needed for the satisfaction of the reasonable needs of fully developed people.

Exposing the lies of the enemies of the working class, who insist that Communists want to level the tastes and needs of all people and abolish all personal ownership, Marx and Engels wrote in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*: "We Communists have been reproached with the desire of abolishing the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labour, which property is alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity and independence.... We by no means intend to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labour, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labour of others. Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labour of others by means of such appropriation."¹

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1962, Vol. 1, pp. 47, 48, 49.

THE MAIN HISTORICAL STAGES OF THE COMMUNIST FORMATION

The higher phase of communism will develop continuously. It is important to stress this, because today many anti-communist ideologists pinpoint the "gaps" in communist doctrine, meaning primarily the outlook for world communism. The emergence and development of the world socialist system and analysis of the most important trends of development in the world revolutionary process, the integral parts of which are the building of socialism and communism by the peoples of the socialist countries, the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement, make it possible to examine a new theoretical problem, that of the main historical stages in the spread of the communist formation throughout the globe.

On the basis of the victorious march of the October Revolution—the creation and development of a new system in the USSR and the other socialist countries—and the main trends of development in the world revolutionary process, it is possible, in our view, to speak of the following basic historical stages in the spread of the communist formation and of its full victory.

The *first historical stage* was completed some time ago. It covers the period of the victory of the October Revolution and the building of socialism on the one-sixth of the earth's surface. The most important criterion for the completion of the first stage was the full and final victory of socialism in the USSR.

All the main and essential features of the new formation and its first phase, the universal laws of its growth, found concrete embodiment in the internationalist experience of the USSR.

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev, said: "The working class of our country became the first contingent of the international army of labour to raze the old, capitalist world and to create a new, socialist world." Further he stressed: "As we look back on the road which we have covered, we can say: indeed, our people and our Party have many things to take pride in. Many difficulties and adversities have fallen to the lot of the Soviet people. On their shoulders they have borne

a tremendous historic responsibility. They have overcome all trials bravely and steadfastly, and carried out its noble mission worthily.... For the first time in the history of world civilisation, socialism has scored a full and final victory, a developed socialist society has been built and the conditions have been created for the successful construction of communism."¹

The *second historical stage* consists of the period of the formation of the world socialist system and its steady transformation into a decisive force in world development.

This stage is characterised by a radical change in the social make-up of the planet. This may be seen from the following figures. By the beginning of 1970 the world population was 3,600 million, of which about 34 per cent were in the socialist countries, 19 per cent in the developed capitalist countries, 46 per cent in the developing countries and only 1 per cent in colonial territories which have not yet been liberated.² The steady consolidation of the co-operation of the socialist states is taking place in the process of this global change in the socio-political face of the world.

The socialist countries are now a union of states whose stability is above comparison with that of any other union or coalition of the past or present.

The world socialist system, which plays a decisive role in the struggle for the full victory of communism, has a revolutionising influence not only on the political and spiritual life of modern society, but also demonstrates the steady increase in the role played by its economy in world social production. The share of the CMEA countries is almost one-third in world industrial production. In order to predict the further development of the world socialist system in the decisive economic sphere it is important to take industrial growth rates into account. In the CMEA countries industrial production has increased almost 6.8 times in the period between 1950 and 1970, whereas the corresponding figure for the developed capitalist countries is only 2.8 times.

The world socialist system is turning into a decisive factor in the development of human society. Together with

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Lenin's Cause Lives On and Triumphs*, pp. 29-30.

² See *Pravda*, April 19, 1970.

other progressive forces fighting against imperialism, for the socialist re-organisation of society, it determines the main content, the main direction and the main features of the present historical development of all mankind.

An important criterion for the completion of the second historical stage in the growth of the communist formation will be the attainment of the firm unity of the socialist community through the struggle against Right-wing and "Left"-wing revisionism and the overcoming of existing disagreements by creative Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. Within the framework of this stage there occurs the continuous collapse in various forms—peaceful and non-peaceful—of new links in the chain of imperialism, and also the final transition of many countries in the "Third World" to the socialist path of development. This will depend not only on the growth of internal revolutionary prerequisites in each country, but also on consolidation of the unity of the world socialist system.

Experience shows that consolidation of unity is possible by overcoming real contradictions, which is a law of development of the world socialist system. Certain general laws are inherent in the development of each socialist country and the world socialist system as a whole. These general laws include the constant strengthening of the new society by the timely, profound disclosing and collective solving of objectively existing and arising non-antagonistic contradictions. The whole spirit of the resolutions of the three international meetings of Communist and Workers' parties held in 1957, 1960 and 1969 is infused with the ideas of the unity of the world communist movement and, above all, of its main offspring—the world socialist system.

The internationalist nature of the communist movement, the superiority of socialism, the common nature of its economic, political and ideological foundations make it quite possible to achieve the stability and unity of the world socialist system.

In order to raise the new social system, particularly the dialectics of its progressive development, a profound examination and knowledge are required of such an important law of communist formation as the steady consolidation of the unity of the world socialist system by overcoming the inner contradictions of its development. To our mind, the discov-

ery, correct understanding and gradual overcoming of the following basic groups of non-antagonistic contradictions are particularly important.

The *first group of contradictions* is connected with the operation of two progressive trends in the development of the socialist countries: on the one hand, the internationalisation of productive forces and of economic and social life in general, and on the other, the development of national socialist states. The correct combination of these trends makes it possible, without grave errors, to gradually overcome the first group of contradictions and ensure the successful establishment of the communist formation.

The *second group of contradictions* is produced by the transition to the path of socialism at different times of countries with different levels of economic, socio-political and cultural development. This group of contradictions gives rise to a number of special features in the methods and rates of the socialist transformation of society. This group of contradictions will also be overcome in the evening out of the level of social development in the socialist countries.

The *third group of contradictions* is engendered by survivals of the past, in particular, elements of the mistrust among peoples which was implanted by the exploiter classes over the centuries. Lenin spoke of the need to remove with the greatest patience and care the mistrust left after centuries of oppression by the landowners and capitalists.

The successful overcoming of objectively existing contradictions in the development of the socialist countries is connected with the operation of the subjective factor: a correct understanding of the contradictions and a skilful democratic method of solving them. The historic advantages of socialism, the consistent application of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the principles of proletarian internationalism, and their creative development, and the scientific approach to the complex processes of social life, make it possible to overcome existing and recurring contradictions and to strive for the steady consolidation of the community of socialist countries. The Communist and Workers' parties have again shown an example of the Leninist approach at their international forum—the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969, which is an important stage

in the struggle for the unity of the forces of the world socialist community and the world communist movement.

Having described the existing contradictions in the development of the world socialist system and basing itself on the main trend of the present stage of the world communist movement, the 24th Congress of the CPSU expressed its conviction that ultimately full unity would be achieved on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

"We want the world socialist system to be a well-knit family of nations, building and defending the new society together, and mutually enriching each other with experience and knowledge, a family, strong and united, which the people of the world would regard as the prototype of the future world community of free nations," said Leonid Brezhnev at the 24th Congress.¹

The democratic and collective method of solving non-antagonistic contradictions, which is based on full equality of rights and free, creative discussion, will ensure further success in the world communist movement.

All manner of revisionists attack this Leninist course. But in the struggle against them by the Marxist-Leninist parties the leading trend in the world communist movement today—the trend towards unity on the basis of proletarian internationalism—will undoubtedly be victorious, thereby ensuring a steady advance forward, to communism.

The *future, third stage* of the growth of the communist formation will be marked by the victory of communism and socialism in many countries of the world socialist system, accelerating the transition of all other countries, including the highly developed capitalist countries, to the path of socialist transformation.

A major criterion of the completion of this stage will be the creation of a single world socialist, and later communist economy. This stage in the growth of the communist formation will be characterised primarily by the existence, as Lenin predicted, "of a single world economy, regulated by the proletariat of all nations as an integral whole and according to a common plan".² At certain levels of develop-

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 19.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 147.

ment in this stage all countries will be socialist: some building socialism and others building communism.

The possibility cannot be excluded that many peoples of the world will complete the transition to the communist formation at the third stage of its growth, when in some countries the higher phase of communism will already be reached, in others socialism, and in still other countries the transition period. One can assume that in the USSR and other socialist countries communism will already be built (fully in some, partially in others), socialism in still others, when many countries complete the transition to building the first phase of communism.

These, to our mind, are the principal stages in the growth and spread of the communist formation.

Today opportunists and revisionists of all kinds are attacking the fundamental tenets of scientific communism. To this end great play is made of the idea of "different national models of socialism", earlier advanced by bourgeois sociologists and later taken up by the revisionists. This idea is based on making an absolute of existing features and diversity of form in the transition to socialism of different countries and on the contrasting these features with the main and decisive laws of the growth of the communist formation.

Historical experience in the building of the new society has disproved the slander of the enemies of Leninism who insist that it denies the originality and special features introduced by each country into the creation of a communist formation. Lenin constantly returned to this problem.

The theses of Lenin's about the general laws of the emergence and development of socialism with full account taken of national features are of exceptional importance for the struggle with modern revisionism.

A great deal of attention was devoted to this question at the 24th Congress of the CPSU. In the Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev said: "Successes in socialist construction largely depend on the correct combination of the general and the nationally specific in social development. Not only are we now theoretically aware but also have been convinced in practice that the way to socialism and its main features are determined by the general regularities, which are inherent in the development of all the socialist countries. We are also aware that the effect of

the general regularities is manifested in different forms consistent with concrete historical conditions and national specifics. It is impossible to build socialism without basing oneself on general regularities or taking account of the concrete historical specifics of each country. Nor is it possible without a consideration of both these factors correctly to develop relations between the socialist states."¹

The revisionist tendency, which rejects the laws of the building of socialism that have already been confirmed in the experience of the Soviet Union and other countries, and the turning of national features into an absolute, have produced the conceptions of different "models of socialism". They are masked by the false slogans of "liberal", "democratic", and "humane" socialism, or "socialism with a human face".

In our day and age life is developing at such rapid pace that the truth or falseness of any theory can be checked in a short space of time. The emergence and development of the world socialist system has confirmed the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory of general laws and special features in the transition from the old system to the new in the various countries. For its part, the idea of different "models of socialism" has already turned into a weapon for weakening and undermining the unity of the world socialist system.

Whereas the characteristic feature of revisionism is rejection of the universal laws of the communist formation, that of dogmatism is the turning of separate formulas and theories into absolutes without taking account of radical changes in the historical situation. The dogmatists automatically extend formulas reflecting phenomena peculiar to antagonistic formations to socialist society which is free from antagonisms and social conflicts. With the help "of dichotomising the whole into mutually exclusive opposites and the implacable struggle between them" they attempt in all manner of ways to justify the policy of dividing the world socialist system and the whole communist movement. But the growth of the communist formation is proceeding through the creative development of Marxism-Leninism, which combines recognition of the universal objective laws

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 9-10.

of the socialist revolution and building of socialism with the need to take into account national features, giving rise to the different forms of this building.

THE HISTORICAL INEVITABILITY OF WORLD COMMUNISM AS THE HIGHEST STAGE OF WORLD CIVILISATION

Communism is not something purely Russian, a national or regional phenomenon characteristic only of Eastern countries, as bourgeois ideologists never tire of asserting. Communism as an international phenomenon is the cause of the whole working class, the peoples of all countries. The Soviet people have ushered in the beginning of the creation of communism. Behind them follow and will follow other nations.

The communist formation is historically inevitable. The objective laws of social development which have been confirmed by the progressive development of human society are responsible for its emergence. But in terms of its historical position communism is substantially different from all preceding formations which make up the pre-history of mankind.

The crucial distinction in this higher stage of the development of society is the universal nature of communism, its inevitable victory throughout the whole world. As we know, not one of the former formations embraced all the countries in the world. The primitive communal system extended to a comparatively small part of the world, primarily in the temperate zones. Not all peoples went through the stages of slave-owning society, feudalism and capitalism. It is evident today that many of the newly-free nations will arrive at socialism bypassing the stage of capitalism.

Only the communist formation—socialism, and then full-scale communism—is inevitable for all countries. Emphasising the universal nature of the communist system, Lenin wrote that “all nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable”.¹

The economic, political and spiritual development of the modern world is leading irresistibly to this progressive society of the future, to world communism.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 69.

14.3
The laws of economic development dictate the need for the overall establishment of public ownership as a condition for the progressive development of the whole of mankind. The gigantic expansion of productive forces, particularly in connection with the modern scientific and technological revolution, has come into sharp conflict with obsolete capitalist production relations. This conflict is manifested in the militarisation of the economy, periodic economic crises, the poverty of the masses, devastating wars, the use of scientific advances for destructive purposes, etc. Only a revolutionary transformation of society by socialising the means of production is capable of eliminating the conflict between the social nature of modern productive forces and capitalist production relations and of creating the conditions for an unprecedented development of the life of society.

This fundamental theoretical proposition of Marxism-Leninism has received practical confirmation in our time in the country which is building communism—the USSR—and the countries proceeding along the socialist path. In these countries the productive forces, released from the fetters of the old society, have been able to develop at rates unheard of under capitalism. The causes of economic crises, poverty, war and other vices of the old exploiter world have disappeared in the socialist countries.

The economic competition between capitalism and socialism, which is increasingly revealing the historical superiority of socialism, is leading to the ultimate victory of communism throughout the world.

On the basis of economic factors there also operate the political laws of development of modern society, which are also leading to the total victory of socialism and communism.

The socialist countries led by the Communist and Workers' parties, the class struggle of the proletariat and other sections of the working people in each of the capitalist countries, and the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples form the common front of the struggle against imperialism.

Lenin's forecasts on the laws and motive forces in the development of world revolution, the formation of the new system, and the future of world communist society, have been confirmed. His new proposition that the victory of so-

cialism was possible at first in a few or even in one capitalist country has been brilliantly confirmed.

On the basis of this inspired discovery by Lenin, the proletariat of all countries has obtained a clear view of the active revolutionary struggle ahead. Aware of the great importance of the proletariat in the industrial countries, Lenin stressed that this is "our chief hope, our chief support".¹

Modern social development, particularly in connection with the scientific and technological revolution, has confirmed Lenin's ideas on the growing strength of the working class. The basic tenet of scientific communism about the historic mission of the working class as the builder of the communist society has been fully confirmed and further enriched in the process of the revolutionary transformation of the modern world. In the Report of the Central Committee to the 24th CPSU Congress Leonid Brezhnev said: "*The international working-class movement continues to play, as it has played in the past, the role of time-tested and militant vanguard of the revolutionary forces. The events of the past five-year period in the capitalist world have fully borne out the importance of the working class as the chief and strongest opponent of the rule of the monopolies, and as a centre rallying all the anti-monopoly forces.*"²

Lenin's forecasts about the awakening and development of peoples oppressed by imperialism have been brilliantly borne out. This tenet advanced by Lenin forms a whole chapter in the development of the world revolution.

The further course of the revolutionary transformation of society is bound up with the scientific and technological revolution. Linked with the latter, in its turn, is the expansion of the social base of the working-class struggle against imperialism. The quantitative and qualitative growth of the working class is promoted by the ruin of the peasantry, the increase in the urban middle strata, particularly the intelligentsia, which is swelling the ranks of wage workers. They are gradually drawing closer to the working class. All this is expanding the circle of allies of the working class. This political army of the proletariat is also being supplemented

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 348.

² 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 22-23.

by a section of young people which, in protesting against the growing oppression of monopoly capitalism, is very active in social life.

To direct these politically inexperienced young people along the Leninist path of revolutionary struggle, to protect them from the corrupting influence of leftist, anarchist, Trotskyite and other old and "new" ultra-fashionable trends, is a pressing task for the Communist parties.

Thus, on a world-wide scale, profound social prerequisites are taking shape for the formation and development of the future society.

A correct understanding of the many-sided and complex processes in the preparation, emergence and development of the future society depends primarily on a profound knowledge of the basic contradiction of our age. The basic contradiction of our time—the struggle of the two worlds, two systems, of capitalism and socialism—is determining the present and future of all mankind. In the process of this struggle two main camps have emerged clearly—the imperialist and the socialist camps.

Many modern states, parties, political groups and public figures have defined their attitude towards these two main camps. One can predict with total certainty the inevitable shrinking of the imperialist camp and the expansion of the socialist one.

In this situation Lenin's programmatic testament about the need to win all the waverers over to socialism is of exceptional importance. "The main task we set ourselves is to defeat the exploiters and to win to our side the waverers—this is a task of historic significance,"¹ he said.

This world task in varying degrees and forms applies to wavering groups and elements in all countries.

In his article devoted to Lenin's birth centenary and entitled "The Teaching That Transforms the World" Walter Ulbricht wrote: "In the struggle for a final solution of the question 'who will beat whom?' on a world-wide scale, three factors above all play a decisive role.

"First, there is the ideological factor. Socialism possesses the necessary weapon to emerge victorious in the ideological

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 323.

struggle. The Leninist teaching, which is developing further theoretically and practically in the struggle for the all-round consolidation of the world socialist system, is the ideology of the most revolutionary force of our time—the working class. It has transformed the world, and will continue to change it.

“Secondly, there is the military factor. The Soviet Union has long since eliminated the one-sided military superiority of imperialism and become the most powerful military force on earth. The technical, scientific and moral superiority of the Soviet Army which is bound by close ties of friendship to the armies of the other socialist states, is today a decisive force ensuring peace throughout the world. And it will continue to do so.

“Thirdly, there is the economic factor. The socialist social system has released all motive forces in order to master the scientific and technological revolution and accelerate even more the rates of economic and social progress. The imperialist system cannot produce anything to match the socialist organisation of science and ability to integrate all scientific, technical and economic potentials.”¹

The strategy and tactics of the natural extension of world revolution were worked out by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1969. The following are the most important points: the steady development and consolidation of the unity of the three main streams of the world revolutionary process; the consistent struggle against imperialism, particularly American imperialism, which is the main danger to the peace, freedom and security of all peoples; intensification of the struggle against imperialist aggression and the struggle for international security; the combination of the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism.

The strategy of the world revolution should not be seen in isolation from the Leninist policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The genuinely Leninist, class interpretation of the policy of peaceful coexistence is of exceptionally great significance. “This policy does not imply either the preservation of the sociopolitical status quo or a weakening of the ideological strug-

¹ *Pravda*, April 7, 1970.

gle. It helps to promote the class struggle against imperialism on a national and world-wide scale."¹

Modern reactionary bourgeois ideology has as its main aim to justify and extol the old, obsolete world of capitalism and discredit and slander the new world of socialism.

Socialist ideology, in full accordance with reality, reveals to the peoples of the world the whole truth, showing the exploiter essence and misanthropic nature of capitalism and the truly humanist character of the socialist system.

On the basis of the experience of the past and, in particular, the growing economic, political and ideological power of the international camp of peace, democracy and socialism, one can predict unerringly the shameful collapse and total failure of the new, increasingly cunning plans of the imperialists against communism.

Communism is against war, because it will win a total victory on the path of peaceful competition with capitalism. This competition will continue until the whole world has done with private ownership and the economic chaos and wars to which it gives rise, and turns to the higher, that is, the communist social system.

SOURCES OF THE UNLIMITED DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNIST SOCIETY

Communism is the ideal of progressive mankind, a real prospect for all the peoples of the world. The best and noblest minds of the peoples of all countries have fought and are fighting for this ideal and perfect system. This struggle of the working class and its communist vanguard is today giving meaning to the life and activity of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. The ideas of communism have become a great, irresistible force: they produce mass heroism on all fronts of the struggle for a new, most just world.

Being unable to prevent the triumphant march of the new world, bourgeois ideologists are constantly searching for new arguments against communism. Bourgeois science, for example, often points to what it calls the inner lack

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 31.*

of agreement between the individual tenets of Marxist philosophy which, on the one hand, recognises contradiction as a source of the emergence, development and disappearance of phenomena and, on the other, maintains that communism is the ideal form of social organisation.

On the basis of this imaginary "lack of correspondence" between the philosophy of dialectical materialism and the theory of scientific communism, some bourgeois ideologists "forecast" the death of dialectics, others the collapse of communism.

The first forecast was made a long time ago by the French Catholic theologian, Professor Henri Chambre, who wrote: "To the extent to which one assumes that there are no more antagonistic contradictions in the Soviet Union and no more exploited workers either, the motive forces of historical development disappear according to K. Marx.... The death of dialectics is what appears on the horizon of the historical development of the Soviet Union."¹

This anti-scientific forecast has been disproved by the rapid development of new motive forces in the ascent of socialist society, and by the further creative enrichment of the Marxist-Leninist dialectics.

New motive forces in the development of the socialist system are steadily progressing, above all, the socialist mode of production with the new type of non-antagonistic contradiction between growing productive forces and actively operating production relations, the moral and political unity of society, the friendship of nations, socialist patriotism, organically fused with proletarian internationalism; the combination of material and moral stimuli in work; the community of aims in the struggle for the full triumph of communism.

A second forecast was also made a long time ago by a member of the West German Institute of Political Science, the well-known "specialist" on Marxism, M. Lange.

He believes that to recognise communism as the ideal form of organising human society means "repeating Hegel's conception". By the logic of things Communists should regard history exactly as Hegel did: history is completed; that which follows is only the further expansion of socialism.

¹ Henri Chambre, *Le Marxisme en Union Soviétique. Idéologie et institutions, leur évolution de 1917 à nos jours*, Paris, 1955, pp. 444, 470.

A similar argument is repeated by Gustav Wetter, who writes: "How can such a dialectic still exist, if the proletarian revolution is supposed to be the last revolution and socialism and communism the last social orders?"¹

These arguments of bourgeois ideologists reveal a confusion of different conceptions in the history of philosophy, primarily German philosophy, a misunderstanding of the basic problems of dialectics and the prospects for the invincible, ascending development of communism.

As we know, the limitations of Hegel's idealist system lay in the fact that it attempted to perpetuate the Prussian monarchy, one of the reactionary forms of the historically *transient* social formation. The progressive development of human society did away with this political form and disproved its theoretical justification.

The dialectico-materialistic teaching of Marxism-Leninism, which develops on the basis of socio-historical practice, provides a profound understanding of the historical process in general and communism in particular.

To obtain a profound knowledge of any phenomenon, any society, one must in the final analysis delve into its specific nature, and study the distinctive features of the contradictions lying at the basis of its development.

Why did all the pre-capitalist socio-economic formations emerge, develop and decline? Why does capitalism, the last antagonistic form of society, share the same fate? Above all because the internal contradictions in the modes of production of all pre-communist formations came into conflict and this led to their internal explosion, to the revolutionary transition from one formation to another.

The communist formation will also emerge and develop steadily in full accordance with the dialectics. Full, comprehensive and rapid development in all spheres of social life will be a characteristic feature of the whole communist formation.

At the basis of the development of all aspects of the communist formation will lie both objective internal contradictions, including the struggle between the new and the old in society, and external contradictions between organised society and cognised yet inexhaustible nature.

¹ G. A. Wetter, *Sowjet Ideologie heute*, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1962, S. 234.

The new society is emerging and developing by overcoming the numerous contradictions of social development. In the system of all real contradictions the principal and constantly operating stimulus in the development of the new society is the non-antagonistic contradiction between the production level attained and the new requirements of the masses, of all members of society, which have been engendered on this basis. The contradiction in question is the source of the unlimited development of the communist formation.

Theses of the Central Committee of the CPSU on Lenin's birth centenary say in part: "The scientific conception of communism has nothing in common either with the pharisaical philosophy of poverty as a blessing or with the bourgeois-philistine cult of things. Material wealth in the Marxist-Leninist understanding is created to satisfy the reasonable requirements of people and is a necessary prerequisite for the development of human abilities, for the individual to find fulfilment."¹

All the contradictions of communist society, above all, its basic contradiction between the steady growth of social and individual needs and the level attained in the production of material and cultural values, ensure the unlimited progressive development of the whole of liberated mankind.

This inner source of the ascending development of the communist formation has become the condition of the successful solving of the external contradiction between socialist society and nature as a whole. A vivid example of the successful solving of this contradiction is the exploration of outer space. The historical fact that the homeland of Leninism became the inaugurator not only of the communist era, but also of the space age in the name of the true freedom and happiness of all mankind is most significant. This, too, shows the historic superiority of the emerging communist formation. The new, steadily growing communist society is defined by Marxism-Leninism as the true history of mankind.

¹ *Lenin's Ideas and Cause Are Immortal*, p. 54.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

ERRATA

- p. 227 Line 21 from top should be read without the word "ref-lects"
- p. 235 The last line of the footnote should read: Berlin, 1971. S. 336.
- p. 238 The first footnote should read: K. Nemitz, op. cit., S. 137-138.

Зак. 0749

The book shows the prospects of human society in the light of the principles of scientific communism, the policy statements of the CPSU and the decisions of its 24th Congress.

The authors make a critical analysis of the main bourgeois philosophical and sociological conceptions of the future, including industrialism, the convergence theory and the neo-nazi theory of "formed society". They demonstrate the inability of the authors of the modern anti-communist theories to foresee the future, for they proceed from positivism, existentialism or structuralism.

The authors treat foreign futurologists in a differentiated way by including the natural scientific conceptions in a separate part of the book and by citing the experience gained both by the Soviet and foreign scientific thought in this sphere.